REQUEST FOR
Planning Commission Action

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING DATE:

NOVEMBER 9, 2020

TITLE:

PUBLIC HEARING – ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT NO. 2020-03 AND GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 2020-06 FOR THE COMPREHENSIVE UPDATE TO THE SANTA ANA GENERAL PLAN

Prepared by Vince Fregoso, AICP

Executive Director

PLANNING COMMISSION SECRETARY

APPROVED
- ☐ As Recommended
- ☐ As Amended
- ☐ Set Public Hearing For _____

DENIED
- ☐ Applicant's Request
- ☐ Staff Recommendation

CONTINUED TO _____

Planning Manager

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Recommend that the City Council:

1. Adopt a resolution certifying Final Environmental Impact Report No. 2020-03 (SCH No. 2020029087), including adoption of environmental findings of fact pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act, adoption of a Statement of Overriding Considerations, and adoption of a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program;

2. Adopt a resolution approving General Plan Amendment No. 2020-06.

DISCUSSION

At the direction of the Mayor and City Council in late 2015, the Planning Division began efforts to complete a comprehensive update to the City's General Plan. The General Plan is a state mandated document that includes goals, policies, implementation measures and maps that will guide Santa Ana's physical growth for the next 25 years. The State of California requires every city to prepare and adopt "a comprehensive, long-term general plan for the physical development of the city, and any land outside its boundaries which is in the planning agency's judgement bears relation to its planning." The role of the General Plan is often referred to as the "Constitution of the City" as it serves as the guiding document by which all land use related decisions must be derived.

The City's current General Plan (with the exception of the Housing Element) was last comprehensively adopted in 1982 and is now 38 years old. The General Plan establishes a community vision and strategies to guide growth, change and community preservation within the City, providing goals and policies to enhance, preserve and protect the unique qualities that the Santa Ana community values. The General Plan is the single-most important tool used to guide communities achieve their vision. As the General Plan is a policy document, it differs from the Zoning Code in that the Zoning Code will identify specific development standards (setbacks, parking, open space etc.) for each parcel in the City. Upon adoption of the General Plan, staff will begin the process to complete a

comprehensive update to the Zoning Code to ensure consistency between the General Plan and Zoning Code.

A General Plan:

- Sets the course for decision making
- Helps balance the interest of residents, business owners and property owners
- Informs and educates the community
- Serves as an effective governance tool for City staff
- Provides guidance for economic decisions
- Ensures the protection of the natural environment
- Identifies implementation actions that should be undertaken to achieve the goals and policies identified in the General Plan

The comprehensive update to the General Plan document, known as "Golden City Beyond – A Shared Vision for Santa Ana," is comprised of two separate documents:

- The General Plan (comprised of three Sections and 12 Elements)
- Environmental Impact Report

Community Outreach

General Plan Advisory Group

Following direction from the City Council in 2015 to comprehensively update the General Plan, in late 2015, a 17-member General Plan Advisory Group (GPAG) was established to provide guidance to City staff and the consultant team early in the process. The GPAG was critical in developing goals and policies that would serve as the foundation of the General Plan elements. The GPAG was also tasked with functions such as formulating a community vision, identifying area-wide and community-wide land use planning issues, and prioritizing economic development activities. The GPAG was comprised of representatives from various commissions, residents, business owners, interest groups, youth and property owners to represent the community's interests. Over the past few years, the GPAC has held several meetings, providing direction to staff on key matters that are now embodied in the updated General Plan.

Development of Core Values

A variety of community issues and considerations were identified through the different community outreach activities. With this community input, and with the input of the GPAG, a Draft General Plan Policy Framework was created in December 2018. Included within the Framework was a set of Community "Core Values" that were created to reflect the voice of the collective Santa Ana community and to express its environmental justice principals. These Core Values: Health, Equity, Sustainability, Culture and Education, serve as the backbone of the goals, policies and implementation items found throughout the General Plan Elements.

Public Outreach

Since starting the General Plan update process in late 2015, the City has sought to meaningfully engage all residents of the community, looking for best practices and community partnerships to reach all residents, especially those that have not traditionally engaged in the public decision making process. The General Plan Outreach Program included a series of over 60 Community Workshops starting in 2015, informational "pop-ups" at community events, presentations to focus groups, and the convening of a General Plan Advisory Group. Moreover, translation services were offered during the meetings, and videos of workshops were archived and made available for those unable to attend.

The City's General Plan is a community-wide vision document that is intended to address and respond to community needs. As such, the comprehensive update to the General Plan required staff to advertise and educate community members about the process to as wide an audience as possible. Over the past five years starting in December 2015, an extensive public outreach campaign to engage the public was conducted to supplement the feedback, input and direction of the GPAG. Public outreach efforts include:

- Over 60 community meetings and workshops
- Individual community workshops within each of the five Focus Areas with over 300 residents, business leaders, and community stakeholders participating in the workshops.
- Distribution of an online community survey with over 650 respondents to collect input on the content of the General Plan
- Approximately 44,000 direct mailers sent to property owners and tenants
- A dedicated webpage (santa-ana.org/general-plan) with continuous updates on the General Plan update process and related documents as well as information about Environmental Justice. Also includes an online web learning tool with a narrated presentation to help educate and increase awareness on Environmental Justice issues.
- Presentations at neighborhood Communication Linkages (CommLink) meetings
- Meetings with Environmental Justice groups (Madison Park Neighborhood Association, Logan Neighborhood Association, Artesia-Pilar Neighborhood Association) on August 31st, October 14th and October 19th
- Attendance at approximately 100 Cares events (daily neighborhood functions and evening City Park events) from late-August through the end of October within Environmental Justice communities to discuss the General plan update with residents
- Development of a video series on the General Plan update
- Planning Commission study sessions on August 24th and September 14th
- City Council study sessions on July 7th and October 20th
- One-on-one meetings with the Planning Commission and City Council

The City continued to participate in outreach meetings and discussions with the community on key issues such as proposed land use changes, open space, and addressing EJ issues facing the community. Councilmembers, the City Manager, the Executive Director of Planning and Building, and City staff have met and will continue to meet with individual neighborhood leaders of disadvantage communities in the Logan and Madison Park neighborhoods as well as walking through the neighborhoods with residents and neighborhood leaders.

PROPOSED 2020-2045 GENERAL PLAN – SANTA ANA: GOLDEN CITY BEYOND

Community Vision Statement

Through a robust dialogue with the community, including residents, business and property owners, and other interested citizens, the City adopted the first long-term Vision Statement. This Vision Statement is not only the foundation for the updated General Plan, but also for all long-term decision making in the City. The Vision Statement memorializes the community's aspirations and describes the "Santa Ana – Golden City Beyond" as embracing the following principles:

- Protect and enhance our cultural and community assets
- Create a land use pattern that promotes healthy and active lifestyles
- Ensure equitable outcomes and land use distributions
- Create a sustainable and livable city
- Promote lifelong education and prosperity

Format and Content of the General Plan

The proposed General Plan is a comprehensive update and reorganization of the current General Plan Document, with the exception of Housing Element, which is on an eight-year cycle and is scheduled to be updated independently of this effort in 2021 to comply with State law. The State mandated elements (Land Use, Circulation, Open Space, Conservation, Noise, Safety and Housing) are organized into three Sections:

- **Services and Infrastructure (Section I)**
  - Community Element
  - Mobility Element
  - Economic Prosperity Element
  - Public Services Element
- **Natural Environment (Section II)**
  - Conservation Element
  - Open Space Element
  - Noise Element
  - Safety Element
- **Built Environment (Section III)**
  - Land Use Element
  - Historic Preservation Element
  - Housing Element (to be updated in 2021)
  - Urban Design Element

A recent State law, SB1000, requires local jurisdictions with disadvantaged communities within the City that are updating their General Plan to identify objectives and policies to reduce unique health risks in disadvantaged communities. Further, SB1000 requires cities to identify policies to promote civil engagement in the decision making process and prioritize improvements and programs that address the needs of disadvantaged communities. The law provides two options for accomplishing

the goals of SB1000: Adopt a separate Environmental Justice Element, or integrate the objectives of SB1000 into the various elements of the General Plan. Because the environmental justice topic touches all aspects and all elements of the General Plan, it was determined early in the process to incorporate environmental justice components as policies woven into the fabric of the various Elements, elevating their importance and prominence in each Element.

As shown in the list on the previous page, the City also elected to prepare additional optional elements (Community, Economic Prosperity, Public Services, Historic Preservation and Urban Design) to address special and unique community priorities. Outlined below is an overview of the 11 Elements that are being updated:

Community Element

The Community Element is a new element of the Santa Ana General Plan. The element reinforces the city's values of recreation, culture, education, health and wellness, and cultivates opportunities for improved quality of life for all residents. The goals and policies of this element can be realized through partnerships with local agencies and organizations on facilities, activities and events throughout Santa Ana

This Element functions in tandem with other elements of the General Plan, such as Open Space, which contains policies related to parks and recreation facilities. Dozens of plans and programs implemented by the City and other agencies and organizations overlap with the goals and policies of this Element, such as the Community Arts and Culture Master Plan, which establishes goals and strategies on topics such as cultural equity, infrastructure for the arts, communitywide access, youth programming, and place making.

There are 3 goals, 27 policies and 16 implementation items associated with this element. This element is not mandated by State law and is an optional element.

Mobility Element

The Mobility Element, known as the Circulation Element in the current General Plan, is the City's blueprint for moving people, goods, and resources throughout the community. Moving beyond mere functionality, the City seeks to improve the quality of life in Santa Ana by providing more complete streets, offering ways to be more active, and conserving natural resources. In planning the City's transportation system for the 21st Century, the City is also making the community safer, more affordable, and more livable.

Santa Ana envisions a balanced multimodal transportation system that supports community values. These values include a vibrant local economy, healthy neighborhoods, health and wellness, and an attractive environment. Context sensitive design solutions strengthen the livability, vitality and safety of our neighborhoods, districts, and corridors.

There are 5 goals, 46 policies and 45 implementation items associated with this Element. This Element is one of the State mandated elements.

Economic Prosperity Element

The Economic Prosperity Element, identified as the Economic Development in the existing General Plan, will ensure Santa Ana's local economy. The Element defines Santa Ana's role in the broader regional economy, expands, maintains, and enhances job opportunities, attracts and retains a balance of business types, provides sufficient revenue for public services, and contributes to the overall quality of life experienced by the City's residents.

The goals and policies of this Element will inform and guide decisions across local government. The City intends that its allocation of resources, the operation of its agencies, and the application of its regulatory authority will grow and diversify the local economy. The city further intends that local economic growth and diversification will reduce poverty, increase overall prosperity, improve health and wellness outcomes, expand housing opportunities, and increase quality of life choices available to City residents.

There are 4 goals, 39 policies and 31 implementation items associated with this Element. This Element is not a State mandated element.

Public Services Element

The Public Services Element, identified as the Public Facilities Element in the current General Plan, provides Santa Ana's diverse population with quality services and infrastructure, including accessible public facilities and enhanced public safety. Anticipated growth will require the City to fulfill community needs and to ensure proper management of those needs. It is important that public facilities and services are equitably distributed and maintained at sustainable levels throughout the community. A wide range of City entities and external agencies work closely together to provide the full spectrum of services and facilities.

There are 3 goals, 38 policies and 40 implementation items associated with this element. This Element is an optional General Plan Element.

Conservation Element

The protection and management of Santa Ana's air, water, and energy resources are essential for a healthy, sustainable and equitable path forward. Additionally, the preservation of the remaining stretches of undisturbed plant and wildlife environment, such as in Santiago Park, is important to residents.

The Conservation Element identifies the community's natural resources and illustrates the benefits for retention, enhancement, and development of these resources towards improving quality of life and the environment as a whole. This Element will guide the City in its efforts to prioritize sustainability and enhance the environment for current and future generations.

The Core Values reinforce the City's commitment to enable all persons to enjoy equal access to healthy environments, healthy food, parks and recreational facilities, and civic engagement opportunities. However, the City recognizes that throughout Santa Ana's communities, some bear a disproportionate burden of pollution and associated health risks. As a result, this element also embraces the concept of environmental justice, which seeks to correct inequity by reducing

pollution and increasing public investment in the communities most affected, while also ensuring their input is considered in decisions that affect them.

There are 4 goals, 38 policies and 39 implementation items associated with this element. This Element is a State mandated Element

Open Space Element

Open space is a limited and valuable resource, providing multiple benefits to those living and working in Santa Ana. Open space provides a place of relaxation and reprieve from the urban environment. Open space also offers places to gather, celebrate, learn or exercise, whether alone, with friends or family, or with other members of the community. Open space is so important that its presence or absence can profoundly shape physical, social, mental and economic health, and overall well-being of the community.

The purpose of the Open Space Element is to identify and preserve open space areas that provide value to the community and enrich the quality of life. Such lands or waters provide value in the form of recreation, health, biodiversity, wildlife conservation and aesthetics. Additionally, open spaces are used for climate change, mitigation and adaption, flood risk reduction, managed natural resources production, agricultural production, and protection from hazardous conditions. The Open Space Element will guide the City in its efforts to plan for open space lands in what is largely a built-out, urban environment. Through this element, opportunities for capturing additional open space in the City will be discussed.

There are 3 goals, 25 policies and 22 implementation items associated with this Element. This Element is a State mandated element.

Noise Element

The purpose of the Noise Element is to appraise noise levels in the community, prepare noise contours to guide land use decisions, and establish measures that address current and future noise impacts. This Element works to ensure that the City limits the exposure of the community to excessive noise levels in noise-sensitive areas and at noise-sensitive times of day. This Element works in tandem with other Elements of the General Plan, such as the Mobility Element, which contains policies related to the mitigation of transportation related noise.

There are 3 goals, 10 policies and 20 implementation items associated with this Element. This Element is one of the State mandated elements.

Safety Element

The Safety Element combines the Public Safety and Seismic Safety elements of the existing General Plan into one document. Public health and safety and protection from the risks of natural and human-induced disasters, emergencies, and hazards are vital in establishing a safe and healthy environment for Santa Ana's residents, workers, and visitors. The purpose of the Safety Element is to eliminate and minimize risks associated with natural and human-generated hazards such as floods, earthquakes, and hazardous materials. By assessing and preparing for levels of risk, the City can endure the range of safety hazards and adapt to changes over time.

This Element works in tandem with other elements of the General Plan, such as the Public Services Element, which contains goals and policies related to police, fire, and health services, as well as emergency planning and resiliency.

There are 4 goals, 25 policies and 26 implementation items associated with this Element. This is a State mandated element.

Historic Preservation Element

The Historic Preservation Element is a new element of the Santa Ana General Plan. Santa Ana was incorporated as a City in 1886 and designated the County seat in 1889. Historic preservation of the City's cultural and architectural heritage is an essential part of the City's economic vitality and identity. Residents take pride in the architectural heritage of the City, including its historical buildings and unique neighborhood character. Sites such as the Old Orange County Courthouse, Pacific Substation, Yost Theatre, and the Spurgeon Building reflect the City's rich cultural history and architectural diversity.

The purpose of the Historic Preservation Element is to provide guidance in developing and implementing activities that ensure that identification, designation and protection of architectural, historical, cultural and archaeological resources are part of the City's planning, development and permitting processes. Through historic preservation policies and programs, Santa Ana's heritage and diversity will continue to be a source of community pride.

There are 3 goals, 21 policies and 28 implementation items associated with this Element. This is an optional element of a General Plan.

Land Use Element

The Land Use Element provides a long-range guide for the physical development of the City, reflecting the community's vision for a high quality of life. This Element guides the distribution, location, and size of new development, ensuring that residential neighborhoods are protected, and future growth is sustainable and minimizes potential conflicts. Through its focus on the pattern of land use, this element is also a tool to promote public health, reduce infrastructure costs, enhance local economies, and address long-term environmental issues such as air quality, climate change and water resources.

The development, use and distribution of land are critical to achieving the City's vision and adhering to the Core Values. As stewards of the land, the City must plan for uses and development that creates a sustainable, healthy and livable City, ensures equitable outcomes and land use distributions, protects and enhances cultural and community assets, and provides opportunities for growth and prosperity. As in other cities, land is a finite and valuable resource. Its use dictates the City's economic and fiscal future.

The Land Use Element preserves existing neighborhoods by directing new growth to major corridors and avoids land use changes in lower density neighborhoods. The five growth areas are identified as Focus Areas. These include South Main Street, Grand /Seventeenth Street, West Santa Ana Boulevard (adjacent to the OC Streetcar line), 55 Freeway/Dyer Road, and South Bristol Street. The proposed Land Use Element will connect existing planning areas in the City (Transit Zoning Code, Harbor Boulevard Mixed-Use Corridor, Metro East Mixed Use Overlay Zone,

etc.,) with the five proposed Focus Areas. Within these Focus Areas, the City anticipates the most potential for development.

There are 4 goals, 42 policies and 41 implementation items associated with this element. This is one of the State mandated elements.

Urban Design Element

Urban design is the process of shaping the physical character and organization of the City and defining the relationship between people and their environment. It respects the history of a place, considers existing organizational patterns and the form and character of existing buildings, supports healthy outdoor spaces, and is mindful of the natural environment. These considerations unite to define a distinct visual quality and sense of place that reflects community values.

The Urban Design Element establishes the long-range vision for the physical development, visual qualities, and sensory experience of the City. This Element, in coordination with other elements of the General Plan, orchestrates a safe, functional and aesthetically pleasing urban environment. Specifically, the Urban Design Element addresses the public realm, building form, and establishes programs and measures to improve the physical setting in which community life takes place while curtailing obsolete, dysfunctional, and chaotic development.

There are 7 goals, 48 policies and 27 implementation items associated with this Element. This is an optional element of the General Plan.

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)

The comprehensive update to the General Plan required extensive environmental review. Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), and after completion of the Initial Study for the project, it was determined that CEQA required the preparation and certification of a program environmental impact report (PEIR) for this project. The purpose of a PEIR is to identify and disclose the significant effects on the environment of a project, to identify alternatives to the project, and to indicate the way those significant effects can be mitigated or avoided. To determine what potential effects would be caused by the project, the Draft PEIR analyzes issues related to: Aesthetics; Air Quality; Biological Resources; Cultural Resources; Energy; Geology and Soils; Greenhouse Gas Emissions; Hazard and Hazardous Materials; Hydrology and Water Quality; Land Use and Planning; Mineral Resources; Noise; Population and Housing; Public Services; Recreation; Transportation; Tribal Cultural Resources; and Utilities and Service Systems. The draft PEIR also studies alternatives to the General Plan update. The draft PEIR analyzes direct and indirect impacts resulting from construction and operation of the proposed project.

On February 26, 2020, a Notice of Preparation was distributed for comment regarding the scope and content of the Draft PEIR. A public scoping meeting was held on March 5, 2020 with 16 persons in attendance and 18 written comment letters received at the conclusion of the 30-day public comment period. The comments were reviewed and addressed as required by CEQA. The comments are included as part of the Final EIR.

Three project alternatives were also analyzed within the document. These included a no project alternative, where the existing General Plan document would remain in effect (Alternative 1); a

reduced intensity alternative with two focus areas (55 Freeway/Dyer Road and South Bristol Street) would be reduced to approximately 50 percent of the maximum densities allowed by their respective land use designation (Alternative 2); and build out of the site to be consistent with the Southern California's Association of Regional Government's (SCAG) RTP/SCS projections, which could result in an approximate 75 percent reduction in both the number of allowable units and commercial/industrial square footage (Alternative 3).

The Draft PEIR determined that the proposed comprehensive update would require mitigation related to air quality, cultural resources, geology and soils, greenhouse gas emissions, noise, and tribal cultural resources. On August 3, 2020, the Draft EIR was circulated for review and comment to public, City Council, Planning Commission, local, regional and state agencies, and interested parties for a 45-day public comment review period that originally ended on September 16, 2020. However, due to community request for additional time to review the document, the comment period was extended by an additional 20 days to October 6, 2020. During the review and comment period, staff held a public hearing to receive comments on the PEIR and held a work-study session with the Planning Commission on August 24, 2020, with an additional work-study session held on September 10, 2020.

The City has evaluated the comments received from persons and agencies on the Draft PEIR and completed detailed Response to Comments, revisions to the Draft PEIR including clarifications and/or corrections to typographical errors, and a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP). The MMRP contains mitigation measures to address impacts to air quality, cultural resources, geology and soils, greenhouse gas emissions, noise, and tribal cultural resources. The response to comments, MMRP and Final EIR were published on October 30, 2020 for public review. The Draft PEIR, responses to comments document, revisions to the Draft PEIR, and the MMRP constitute the Final PEIR for the project.

The PEIR identifies five significant and unavoidable impacts associated with this project, which pertain to Air Quality, Cultural Resources, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Noise and Population and Housing. Air Quality impacts stem from the General Plan update being inconsistent with the South Coast Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) as buildout under the plan would exceed the population estimates assumed for the AQMP and would cumulatively contribute to the nonattainment designations of the South Coast Air Basin (SoCAB). Further, construction activities associated with buildout of the General Plan update would generate short-term emissions that exceed the AQMD's significance thresholds and cumulatively contribute to the nonattainment designations of the SoCAB. Buildout would also generate long-term emissions and expose sensitive receptors to substantial concentrations of toxic air contaminants. Finally, construction and operation emissions generated by individual development projects have the potential to exceed the AQMD's local significance thresholds. Cultural Resource impacts result from the proposed General Plan allowing development in areas that have historic resources identified by previous cultural resource surveys, with development in these areas potentially causing the disturbance of historic resources in the plan area. Greenhouse Gas Emissions would result in a decrease in GHG emissions in 2045 but may not meet the long-term GHG reduction goal under Executive Order S-03-05. Due to the potential for proximity of construction activities to sensitive uses, the number of construction projects, and the longevity of the projects, construction noise

could result in a temporary increase in noise levels above ambient conditions. Further, buildout of the General Plan update would expose residents to projects generating traffic noise. Finally, the buildout anticipated by the General Plan update would result in an increase in population and housing units that exceed the Orange County Council of Government projections by up to 38 percent, with no feasible mitigation measure to address the issue.

These impacts cannot be mitigated to a less than significant level, and even with the inclusion of feasible policies and implementation items proposed in the General Plan, adoption of a Statement of Overriding Considerations is required prior to approving the project. A Statement of Overriding Considerations is the process through which decision makers balance the economic, legal, social, and technological or other benefits of the proposed project against its unavoidable environmental impacts.

Airport Land Use Commission Review

The proposed changes to the Land Use Element to adopt the South Bristol and the 55 Freeway/Dyer Road Focus Areas required the General Plan update to be presented to the Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) for a determination of consistency with their Airport Environs Land Use Plan (AELUP). On October 15th, 2020 the ALUC determined that the General Plan update conflicts with the goals and objectives of the AELUP and voted 5:0 to find the General Plan update inconsistent with their plan. As a result, on October 16th, 2020, at a special City Council meeting, the Council directed staff to file a Notice of Intent to Overrule the ALUC's determination. This action is tentatively scheduled to be heard by the City Council on December 1, 2020.

Conclusion

The proposed comprehensive update to the General Plan will guide development with the City for the next 25 years. The goals, policies and implementation items within the 11 Elements have been developed through extensive input from the community. Further, extensive outreach on the General Plan update has assisted in shaping the final vision expressed within the Elements. Based on the analysis above, it is recommended that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council adopt a resolution certifying Final Environmental Impact Report No. 2020-03 (SCH No. 2020029087), adopt the environmental findings of fact pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act, adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations, and adopt the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program. In addition, staff recommends that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council adopt a resolution approving General Plan Amendment No. 2020-06.

Vince Fregoso, AICP
Planning Manager

s/Planning Commission/2020/11-05-20/EIR No. 2020-03 and GPA No. 2020-06

Exhibits:

1. EIR Resolution, including Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP)
2. General Plan Amendment Resolution & Exhibits
3. Final EIR Link
4. Final General Plan 2045 - Santa Ana Beyond Link

EXHIBIT 1

2 - 13

RESOLUTION NO. 2020-xx

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SANTA ANA (1) CERTIFYING THE FINAL PROGRAM ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR THE GENERAL PLAN UPDATE (STATE CLEARINGHOUSE NO. 2020029087), (2) ADOPTING ENVIRONMENTAL FINDINGS OF FACT AND A STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS FOR THE GENERAL PLAN UPDATE PURSUANT TO THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT, (3) ADOPTING THE MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM, AND (4) APPROVING THE PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN UPDATE

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SANTA ANA AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. The City Council of the City of Santa Ana hereby finds, determines and declares as follows:

WHEREAS, the City of Santa Ana seeks to approve the City of Santa Ana General Plan Update ("proposed project"); and

WHEREAS, the project as currently proposed entails, among other things, (1) adoption of the Santa Ana General Plan Update; (2) Certification of a Program Environmental Impact Report (the "PEIR"); (3) Adoption of Finding of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations; (4) Adoption of the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program; and (5) Adoption of any ordinances, guidelines, programs, actions, or other mechanisms that implement the Santa Ana General Plan update; and

WHEREAS, the proposed project has been submitted and requires review and certification of the PEIR (State Clearinghouse/SCH No. 2020029087) (Environmental Impact Report No. 2020-03) and the adoption of the Santa Ana General Plan Update; and

WHEREAS, the City of Santa Ana is in the western central portion of Orange County, approximately 30 miles southwest of the city of Los Angeles and 10 miles northeast of the city of Newport Beach. The city is bordered by the city of Orange and unincorporated areas of Orange County to the north, the city of Tustin to the east, the cities of Irvine and Costa Mesa to the south, and the cities of Fountain Valley and Garden Grove to the west. In November 2019, the City annexed the 17th Street Island, a 24.78-acre area in the northeast portion of the city. The 17th Street Island is bounded by State Route 55 to the east, 17th Street to the south, and North Tustin Avenue to the west. The city also includes a portion of the Santa Ana River Drainage Channel within

its sphere of influence (SOI); and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 21067 of the Public Resources Code, and Section 15367 of the State CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, § 15000 et seq.), the City of Santa Ana is the lead agency for the proposed project; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15063(a), the City as lead agency determined that a program EIR was clearly required for the project, and therefore did not prepare an initial study; and

WHEREAS, the City determined that a program EIR should be prepared to evaluate the proposed project's potential to have a significant effect on the environment in all of the following areas as required by Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines: Aesthetics; Air Quality; Biological Resources; Cultural Resources; Energy; Geology and Soils; Greenhouse Gas Emissions; Hazards and Hazardous Materials; Hydrology and Water Quality; Land Use and Planning; Noise; Population and Housing; Public Services and Recreation; Transportation; Tribal Cultural Resources; Utilities and Service Systems; and Project Alternatives; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15082, on February 26, 2020, the City sent to the Office of Planning and Research and each responsible and trustee agency a Notice of Preparation ("NOP")—which was also published in the Orange County Register, a newspaper of general circulation in the City of Santa Ana—stating that an environmental impact report (SCH No. 2020029087) would be prepared; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21083.9 and State CEQA Guidelines Sections 15082(c) and 15083, the City held a duly noticed scoping meeting on Thursday, March 5, 2020, to solicit comments on the scope of the environmental review of the proposed project; and

WHEREAS, 18 comment letters were received in response to the NOP; and

WHEREAS, a Draft PEIR was prepared for the proposed project addressing comments received in response to the NOP and evaluating the proposed project's potentially significant environmental impacts; and

WHEREAS, the Draft PEIR identifies five significant and unavoidable impacts associated with the project that pertain to Air Quality, Cultural Resources, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Noise, and Population and Housing. Air Quality impacts stem from inconsistency with the South Coast Air Quality Management District's (AQMD) air quality management plan (AQMP) and exceedance of the South Coast AQMD's significance thresholds that would cumulatively contribute to the nonattainment designations of the South Coast Air Basin (SoCAB), and would result in long-term emissions that would exceed South Coast AQMD's significance thresholds and again cumulatively contribute to the nonattainment designations of the SoCAB. Cultural Resources impacts result from significant impacts to historical resources that may be

considered unavoidable and therefore significant. Greenhouse Gas Emissions impacts stem from the inability to meet the year 2050 GHG reduction goal set by California Executive Order S-03-05. Noise impacts result from a substantial increase in noise levels above ambient conditions due to construction noise and project-generated traffic noise for existing residences along affected roadways. Lastly, population impacts stem from population and housing growth at buildout being larger than Orange County Council of Government's 2045 population and housing projections; and

WHEREAS, the Draft PEIR further determines that mitigation measures are required to address impacts to Aesthetics, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, Noise and Tribal Cultural Resources, and Utilities and Service Systems; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15085, a Notice of Completion was prepared and filed with the Office of Planning and Research on February 26, 2020; and

WHEREAS, as required by State CEQA Guidelines Section 15087(a), the City provided a Notice of Availability of the Draft PEIR to the public—and published the Notice of Availability in the Orange County Register—at the same time that the City sent a Notice of Completion to the Office of Planning and Research on August 3, 2020; and

WHEREAS, during the public comment period, copies of the Draft PEIR and technical appendices were available for review and inspection at City Hall (20 Civic Center Plaza), on the City's website, and at the Santa Ana Public Library (26 Civic Center Plaza); and

WHEREAS, during the public comment period, Planning Commission work-study sessions were held on August 24, 2020 and September 14, 2020 where staff presented the proposed project and described the Draft PEIR; and

WHEREAS, consistent with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15087(e), the Draft PEIR was circulated for a 45-day review period, from August 3, 2020, to September 16, 2020; and was extended for review 20 days thereafter to October 6, 2020; and

WHEREAS, during the 45-day public comment period, the City consulted with and requested comments from all responsible and trustee agencies, other regulatory agencies, and others pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15086; and

WHEREAS, the City has complied with CEQA environmental review requirements; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21092.5, on October 30, 2020, the City provided copies of its responses to commenting public agencies and interested organizations and parties more than 10 days prior to the City's consideration of the Final PEIR; and

WHEREAS, on November 3, 2020, the City released the Final PEIR, attached hereto as Exhibit "A", which consists of the Draft PEIR, all technical appendices prepared in support of the Draft PEIR, all written comment letters received on the Draft PEIR, written responses to all written comment letters received and verbal comments received on the Draft PEIR, revisions to the Draft PEIR and technical appendices, and the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program; and

WHEREAS, on November 9, 2020, the Planning Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing to consider the PEIR and the General Plan Update, and the associated EIR and GPA applications. After hearing all relevant testimony from staff, the public, and the City's consultant team, the Planning Commission voted to recommend that the City Council certify the PEIR; adopt the findings of fact, the statement of overriding considerations, and the mitigation monitoring and reporting program; and approve the project; and

WHEREAS, on November 20, 2020, the City gave public notice of a City Council public hearing for consideration of the PEIR No. 2020-03 (State Clearinghouse No. 2020029087) by publishing in the Orange County Register, a newspaper of general circulation in the City of Santa Ana, and by mailing to owners of property and residents within 500 feet of the proposed Focus Areas, those individuals on the project interest list, and those individuals on the PEIR Notice of Availability list; and

WHEREAS, on December 1, 2020, the City Council conducted a duly noticed public hearing to consider the PEIR, at which hearing members of the public were afforded an opportunity to comment upon Environmental Impact Report No. 2020-03. After hearing all relevant testimony from staff, the public, and the City's consultant team, the City Council voted to certify the PEIR; adopt the findings of fact, the statement of overriding considerations, and the mitigation monitoring and reporting program; and approve the project; and

WHEREAS, the "PEIR" consists of the Final PEIR, and all attachments and appendices to the Final PEIR, as well as the Draft PEIR and its attachments and appendices (as modified by the Final PEIR); and

WHEREAS, all potentially significant adverse environmental impacts were sufficiently analyzed in the PEIR; and

WHEREAS, as contained herein, the City Council has endeavored in good faith to set forth the basis for its decision and recommendations on the project; and

WHEREAS, all of the requirements of the Public Resources Code and the State CEQA Guidelines have been satisfied by the City in connection with the preparation of the PEIR, which is sufficiently detailed so that all of the potentially significant environmental effects of the project have been adequately evaluated; and

WHEREAS, all of the findings and conclusions made by the City Council pursuant to this Resolution are based upon the oral and written evidence presented to it as a whole and the entirety of the administrative record for the PEIR project, which

are incorporated herein by this reference, and not based solely on the information provided in this Resolution; and

WHEREAS, the City Council finds that the project's significant environmental impacts that cannot be mitigated to a less than significant level even with incorporation of all feasible mitigation measures, as identified in the PEIR, are described in Section V of the Findings of Fact, attached hereto as Exhibit "B"; and

WHEREAS, the City Council finds that the PEIR project's environmental impacts that are less than significant with the incorporation of mitigation measures, as identified in the PEIR, are described in Section IV of the Findings of Fact, attached hereto as Exhibit "B"; and

WHEREAS, the City Council finds that environmental impacts that are identified in the PEIR as less than significant and do not require mitigation are described in Section III of the Findings of Fact, attached hereto as Exhibit "B"; and

WHEREAS, the potential significant and irreversible environmental changes that would result from the project identified in the PEIR and set forth herein, are described in Section VI of the Findings of Fact, attached hereto as "Exhibit B"; and

WHEREAS, the existence of any growth-inducing impacts resulting from the PEIR project identified in the PEIR and set forth herein, are described in Section VII of the Findings of Fact, attached hereto as Exhibit "B"; and

WHEREAS, alternatives to the PEIR project that might further reduce the PEIR project's environmental impacts are described in Section VIII of the Findings of Fact, attached hereto as Exhibit "B"; and

WHEREAS, prior to taking action, the City Council has heard, been presented with, reviewed, and considered all of the information and data in the administrative record, including but not limited to the PEIR and all oral and written evidence presented to it during all meetings and hearings; and

WHEREAS, the PEIR reflects the independent judgment of the City Council and is deemed adequate for purposes of making decisions on the merits of the proposed project; and

WHEREAS, no comments made in the public hearing conducted by the City Council and no additional information submitted to the City have produced substantial new information requiring recirculation of the PEIR or additional environmental review of the project under Public Resources Code Section 21092.1 and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5; and

WHEREAS, all other legal prerequisites to the adoption of this Resolution have occurred.

NOW THEREFORE, THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SANTA ANA DOES RESOLVE, DETERMINE, FIND, AND ORDER AS FOLLOWS:

Section 2. The City Council hereby finds that it has been presented with the PEIR, which it has reviewed and considered, and further finds that the PEIR is an accurate and objective statement that has been completed in full compliance with CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines, and that the PEIR reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the City, acting as lead agency for the project.

Section 3. The City Council declares that no evidence of new significant impacts or any new information of "substantial importance," as defined by State CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5, has been received by the City after circulation of the Draft PEIR that would require recirculation of the PEIR.

Section 4. The City Council hereby:

1. Certifies the PEIR based on the entirety of the record of proceedings.

2. Adopts the Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations, attached hereto and incorporated herein as Exhibit "B", after balancing the significant and unavoidable air quality, cultural resources, greenhouse gas emissions, noise, and population and housing impacts of the proposed project against the benefits of the proposed project.

3. Adopts the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program attached hereto and incorporated herein as Exhibit "C", consistent with Public Resources Code Section 21081.6; makes implementation of the mitigation measures in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program a condition of approval of the project; and finds that in the event of any inconsistencies between the mitigation measures set forth herein and the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program shall control.

4. Directs City staff to cause a Notice of Determination to be filed and posted with the County of Orange Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk and the State Clearinghouse within five working days of the City Council's final project approval.

Section 5. This Resolution shall take effect immediately upon its adoption by the City Council, and the Clerk of the Council shall attest to and certify the vote adopting this Resolution.

ADOPTED this ___ day of _____, 2020.

_____

Miguel A. Pulido
Mayor

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
Sonia R. Carvalho
City Attorney

By:_____
Lisa Storck
Assistant City Attorney

AYES: Councilmembers_____

NOES: Councilmembers_____

ABSTAIN: Councilmembers_____

NOT PRESENT: Councilmembers_____

CERTIFICATE OF ATTESTATION AND ORIGINALITY

I, Daisy Gomez, Clerk of the Council, do hereby certify the attached Resolution No. 2020-____ to be the original resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Santa Ana on _____, 2020.

Date: _____

_____
Clerk of the Council
City of Santa Ana

CEQA FINDINGS OF FACT

FOR THE

SANTA ANA GENERAL PLAN UPDATE

FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

City of Santa Ana

STATE CLEARINGHOUSE NO. 2020029087

I. INTRODUCTION

The California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") requires that a number of written findings be made by the lead agency in connection with certification of an environmental impact report ("EIR") prior to approval of the project pursuant to Sections 15091 and 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines and Section 21081 of the Public Resources Code. The State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 provides:

(a) No public agency shall approve or carry out a project for which an EIR has been certified which identifies one or more significant environmental effects of the project unless the public agency makes one or more written findings for each of those significant effects, accompanied by a brief explanation of the rationale for each finding. The possible findings are:

1. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR.

2. Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can or should be adopted by such other agency.

3. Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.

(b) The findings required by subdivision (a) shall be supported by substantial evidence in the record.

(c) The finding in subdivision (a)(2) shall not be made if the agency making the finding has concurrent jurisdiction with another agency to deal with identified feasible mitigation measures or alternatives. The finding in subsection (a)(3) shall describe the specific reasons for rejecting identified mitigation measures and project alternatives.

EXHIBIT B

(d) When making the findings required in subdivision (a)(1), the agency shall also adopt a program for reporting on or monitoring the changes which it has either required in the project or made a condition of approval to avoid or substantially lessen significant environmental effects. These measures must be fully enforceable through permit conditions, agreements, or other measures.

(e) The public agency shall specify the location and custodian of the documents or other materials which constitute the record of the proceedings upon which its decision is based.

(f) A statement made pursuant to Section 15093 does not substitute for the findings required by this section.

Public Resources Code Section 21061.1 defines "feasible" to mean "capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, social, and technological factors." CEQA Guidelines section 15364 adds another factor: "legal" considerations. (See *Citizens of Goleta Valley v. Board of Supervisors* (1990) 52 Cal.3d 553, 565 (*Goleta II*).)

The concept of "feasibility" also encompasses the question of whether a particular alternative or mitigation measure promotes the underlying goals and objectives of a project. (*California Native Plant Soc. v. City of Santa Cruz* (2009) 177 Cal.App.4th 957, 1001 ["an alternative 'may be found infeasible on the ground it is inconsistent with the project objectives as long as the finding is supported by substantial evidence in the record'"].) An alternative may also be rejected because it "would not 'entirely fulfill' [a] project objective." (*Citizens for Open Government v. City of Lodi* (2012) 205 Cal.App.4th 296, 314-315.) "[F]easibility" under CEQA encompasses 'desirability' to the extent that desirability is based on a reasonable balancing of the relevant economic, environmental, social, and technological factors." (*City of Del Mar v. City of San Diego* (1982) 133 Cal.App.3d 410, 417; see also *Sequoyah Hills Homeowners Assn. v. City of Oakland* (1993) 23 Cal.App.4th 704, 715.)

With respect to a project for which significant impacts are not avoided or substantially lessened, a public agency, after adopting proper findings, may nevertheless approve the project if the agency first adopts a statement of overriding considerations setting forth the specific reasons why the agency found that the project's "benefits" rendered "acceptable" its "unavoidable adverse environmental effects." (CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15093, 15043, subd. (b); see also Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (b).) The California Supreme Court has stated, "[t]he wisdom of approving . . . any development project, a delicate task which requires a balancing of interests, is necessarily left to the sound discretion of the local officials and their constituents who are responsible for such decisions. The law as we interpret and apply it simply requires that those decisions be informed, and therefore balanced." (*Goleta II*, *supra*, 52 Cal.3d at p. 576.)

When adopting Statements of Overriding Considerations, State CEQA Guidelines Section 15093 further provides:

(a) CEQA requires the decision-making agency to balance, as applicable, the economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of a proposed project against its unavoidable environmental risks when determining whether to approve the project. If the specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of a proposal project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, the adverse environmental effects may be considered "acceptable."

(b) Where the lead agency approves a project which will result in the occurrence of significant effects which are identified in the final EIR but are not avoided or substantially lessened, the agency shall state in writing the specific reasons to support its action based on the final EIR and/or other information in the record. This statement of overriding considerations shall be supported by substantial evidence in the record.

(c) If an agency makes a statement of overriding considerations, the statement should be included in the record of the project approval and should be mentioned in the notice of determination. This statement does not substitute for, and shall be in addition to, findings required pursuant to Section 15091.

Having received, independently reviewed, and considered the Draft Program Environmental Impact Report ("Draft PEIR") and the Final Program Environmental Impact Report ("Final PEIR") for the Santa Ana General Plan Update, SCH No. 2020029087 (collectively, the "PEIR"), as well as all other information in the record of proceedings on this matter, the following Findings of Facts ("Findings") are hereby adopted by the City of Santa Ana ("City") in its capacity as the CEQA Lead Agency.

These Findings set forth the environmental basis for the discretionary actions to be undertaken by the City for adoption and implementation of the Santa Ana General Plan Update ("Proposed Project"). This action includes the certification of the following:

§ Santa Ana General Plan Update Program Environmental Impact Report, SCH No. 2020029087

A. DOCUMENT FORMAT

These Findings have been organized into the following sections:

1) Section I provides an introduction.

2) Section II provides a summary of the project, overview of the discretionary actions required for approval of the project, and a statement of the project's objectives.

3) Section III provides a summary of previous environmental reviews related to the project area that took place prior to the environmental review done specifically for the project, and a summary of public participation in the environmental review for the project.

4) Section IV sets forth findings regarding the environmental impacts that were determined to be—as a result of the Notice of Preparation (NOP) and consideration of comments received during the NOP comment period—either not relevant to the project or clearly not at levels that were deemed significant for consideration given the nature and location of the proposed project.

5) Section V sets forth findings regarding significant or potentially significant environmental impacts identified in the Draft FEIR that the City has determined are either not significant or can feasibly be mitigated to a less than significant level through the imposition of project design features and/or mitigation measures. In order to ensure compliance and implementation, all of these measures are included in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program ("MMRP") for the project and adopted as conditions of the project by the Lead Agency. Where potentially significant impacts can be reduced to less than significant levels through adherence to project design features and/or mitigation measures, these findings specify how those impacts were reduced to an acceptable level. Section V also includes findings regarding those significant or potentially significant environmental impacts identified in the Draft PEIR that will or may result from the project and which the City has determined cannot feasibly be mitigated to a less than significant level.

6) Section VI sets forth findings regarding alternatives to the proposed project.

7) Section VII sets forth the statement of overriding considerations for the proposed project.

8) Section VIII sets forth the resolution regarding certification of the PEIR

9) Section IX sets for the resolution adopting a mitigation and monitoring plan for the proposed project.

10) Section X sets for the resolution regarding custodian of records for the proposed project.

B. RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

For purposes of CEQA and these Findings, the Record of Proceedings for the proposed project consists of the following documents and other evidence, at a minimum:

§ The NOP and all other public notices issued by the City in conjunction with the proposed project

§ The DEIR for the proposed project

§ The FEIR for the proposed project

§ All written comments submitted by agencies or members of the public during the public review comment period on the Draft PEIR

- § All responses to written comments submitted by agencies or members of the public during the public review comment period on the Draft PEIR
- § All written and verbal public testimony presented during a noticed public hearing for the proposed project
- § The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
- § The reports and technical memoranda included or referenced in the Response to Comments
- § All documents, studies, EIRs, or other materials incorporated by reference in the Draft PEIR and Final PEIR
- § The Resolutions adopted by the City of Santa Ana in connection with the proposed project, and all documents incorporated by reference therein, including comments received after the close of the comment period and responses thereto
- § Matters of common knowledge to the City of Santa Ana, including but not limited to federal, state, and local laws and regulations
- § Any documents expressly cited in these Findings
- § Any other relevant materials required to be in the record of proceedings by Public Resources Code Section 21167.6(e)

The documents and other material that constitute the record of proceedings on which these findings are based are located at the City of Santa Ana Planning Division Counter. The custodian for these documents is the City of Santa Ana. This information is provided in compliance with Public Resources Code Section 21081.6(a)(2) and 14 California Code Regulations Section 15091(e).

C. CUSTODIAN AND LOCATION OF RECORDS

The documents and other materials that constitute the administrative record for the City's actions related to the project are at the City of Santa Ana Planning Division, 20 Civic Center Plaza, M-20, Santa Ana, CA 92701. The City's Planning Division is the custodian of the administrative record for the project. Copies of these documents, which constitute the record of proceedings, are and at all relevant times have been and will be available upon request at the offices of the Planning Division Counter. This information is provided in compliance with Public Resources Code Section 21081.6(a)(2) and 14 California Code Regulations Section 15091(e).

II. PROJECT SUMMARY

A. PROJECT LOCATION

Santa Ana is in the western central portion of Orange County, approximately 30 miles southwest of the city of Los Angeles and 10 miles northeast of Newport Beach. Orange County is surrounded by the counties of Los Angeles, San Bernardino, Riverside, and San Diego and is one of six counties comprising the Southern California Region.

Santa Ana is bordered by Orange and unincorporated areas of Orange County to the north, Tustin to the east, Irvine and Costa Mesa to the south, and Fountain Valley and Garden Grove to the west. In November 2019, the City annexed the 17th Street Island, a 24.78-acre area in the northeast portion of the city. The 17th Street Island is bounded by State Route 55 to the east, 17th Street to the south, and North Tustin Avenue to the west. The city also includes a portion of the Santa Ana River Drainage Channel in its sphere of influence (SOI). The city and its SOI are defined and referred to herein as the plan area.

Regional access to the city is provided by the Garden Grove Freeway (SR-22) and the Orange Freeway (SR-57) on the north, the Santa Ana Freeway (1-5) on the northeast, the Costa Mesa Freeway (SR-55) on the east, and the San Diego Freeway (I-405) on the south.

B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

In March 2014, the City Council adopted the Santa Ana Strategic Plan. The Strategic Plan was the result of an extensive community outreach process and established specific goals, objectives, and strategies to guide the City's major efforts. One of the key strategies identified was to complete a comprehensive update of the existing General Plan. The General Plan Update (GPU) will provide long-term policy direction to guide the physical development, quality of life, economic health, and sustainability of the Santa Ana community through 2045. The General Plan Update will identify areas of opportunity and provide options to enhance development potential in key areas of the city. It will also bring the city into compliance with recent State laws, reflect current conditions, and incorporate input from the general public, City staff, and other stakeholders.

The proposed GPU is organized into three sections: I, Services and Infrastructure; II, Natural Environment; and III, Built Environment. The proposed GPU addresses the seven topics required by state law as well as five optional topics. State law gives jurisdictions the discretion to incorporate optional topics and to address any of these topics in a single element or across multiple elements of the general plan. The 12 proposed elements of the GPU will replace the 16 elements of the current General Plan. The GPU will incorporate the current 2014–2021 housing element, and no substantive changes are anticipated. The topic of housing will be addressed as a separate effort in late 2021 in accordance with State law. The topic of environmental justice will be incorporated throughout the GPU, with goals and policies incorporated into multiple elements. The 12 elements of the proposed General Plan update are:

Mandatory Topics

- § Land Use Element
- § Circulation Element
- § Housing Element
- § Open Space Element
- § Conservation Element
- § Safety Element
- § Noise Element

Optional Topics

- § Public Services Element
- § Urban Design Element
- § Community Element
- § Economic Prosperity Element
- § Historic Preservation Element

The proposed GPU is comprehensive both in its geography and subject matter. It addresses the entire territory within the plan area's boundary and the full spectrum of issues associated with management of the plan area. The GPU also includes forecasts of long-term conditions and outlines development goals and policies; exhibits and diagrams; and the objectives, principles, standards, and plan proposals throughout its various elements. The GPU can be found online at https://www.santa-ana.org/general-plan. The General Plan Policy Framework can be accessed at
https://www.santa-ana.org/sites/default/files/pb/general-plan/documents/GeneralPlanPolicyFrameworkMaster.DRAFT.cmo2.pdf

Coordination and consistency are essential between the elements of the GPU, but in particular with the land use element. The circulation element, which identifies proposed improvements to the transportation system, may impact surrounding land uses and future development. The urban design element sets forth policies and programs to improve the city's design and urban form. The conservation element protects and maintains the city's natural, cultural, and other resources, with a focus on preserving aesthetics and the environmental quality of the city.

Both the land use element and the circulation element are described in more depth below. Focus areas and specific plan/special zoning areas are also described.

Updated Land Use Element

The updated land use element will guide growth and development (e.g., infill development, redevelopment, use, and revitalization/restoration) within the plan area by designating land uses as shown in the proposed land use map. Figure 3-7 of the Draft PEIR shows the 13 proposed land use designations of the General Plan update, and Table 3-4 of the Draft PEIR gives a general description of the land use designations that are added to the GPU and were not in the current General Plan. Land use designations define the type and nature of development that would be allowed in a given location of the plan area. The land use designations and patterns are intended to provide the basis for more detailed zoning designations and development intensities, requirements, and standards established in the City's development code.

It is important to note that the updated land use element is a regulatory document that defines the framework for future growth and development in the plan area but does not directly result in development in and of itself. Before any project can be developed in the plan area, it must be

analyzed for conformance with the General Plan Update, zoning requirements, and other applicable local and state requirements; comply with the requirements of CEQA; and obtain all necessary clearances and permits.

Updated Mobility (Circulation) Element

The Mobility Element update is integrally related to federal, state, and regional transportation programs as well as local plans and regulations. The City's role in transportation planning has become increasingly important because recent legislation in the areas of growth management, congestion management, and air quality require more active local coordination to meet regional objectives. Furthermore, the Mobility Element update is intended to guide future development of the city's transportation system in a manner consistent with the updated land use element.

The Master Plan of Streets and Highways (MPSH) details proposed street classifications to reflect buildout of the city's roadway system. The street classifications include Freeway, Major Arterial, Primary Arterial, Secondary Arterial, Divided Collector Arterial, and Collector Arterial. As part of the implementation of complete streets principles,[1] a series of modifications to the city's roadway network has been identified and includes both the reclassification of roadways and assignment of new MPSH roadway classifications to selected existing streets.

A number of proposed roadway reclassifications, adoptions, and removals from the MPSH are as follows:

- Reclassified as Divided Collector Arterial:
  - Santa Clara Avenue between Grand Avenue and SR-55 freeway (currently Secondary Arterial)
  - Flower Street between Warner Avenue and 1st Street (currently Secondary Arterial)
  - Chestnut Avenue between Standard Avenue and eastern city limit (currently Secondary/Primary Arterial)
  - Raitt Street between Segerstrom Avenue and Santa Ana Boulevard (currently Secondary Arterial)
  - Civic Center Drive between Fairview Street and Bristol Street (currently Secondary Arterial)
  - Penn Way between I-5 on/off ramps and Washington Avenue (currently Secondary Arterial)
  - Santiago Street between Washington Avenue and 6th Street (currently Secondary Arterial)
  - Standard Avenue between 6th Street and Warner Avenue (currently Secondary Arterial)

[1] Complete streets are transportation facilities that are planned, designed, operated, and maintained to provide safe mobility for all users, including bicyclists, pedestrians, transit vehicles, truckers, and motorists, appropriate to the function and context of the facility.

- Santa Ana Boulevard between French Street and Santiago Street (currently Primary Arterial)
- Santa Ana Boulevard between Raitt Street and Flower Street (currently Major Arterial)
- Cambridge Street between Fairhaven Avenue and SR-22 freeway (currently Secondary Arterial)
- Hazard Avenue between Euclid Street and Harbor Boulevard (currently Secondary Arterial)
- Halladay Avenue between Warner Avenue and Dyer Road (currently Secondary Arterial)
- McFadden Avenue between Harbor Boulevard and Grand Avenue (currently Secondary Arterial)
- Broadway between 1st Street and 17th Street (currently Secondary Arterial)
- 4th Street between French Street and Grand Avenue (currently Primary/Secondary Arterial)
- Fairhaven Avenue from Grand Avenue to Tustin Avenue (currently Secondary Arterial)

§ Reclassified as Primary Arterial:
- Santa Ana Boulevard between Flower Street and Ross Street (currently a Major Arterial)
- 1st Street between Bristol Street and Tustin Avenue (currently Major Arterial)

§ Reclassify as Collector Arterial:
- Civic Center Drive between French Street and Santiago Street (currently a Secondary Arterial)

§ Add the following to the MPSH as Divided Collector Arterial:
- Greenville Street between Segerstrom Avenue and Warner Avenue

§ Add the following to the MPSH as Collector Streets:
- Greenville Street between Edinger Avenue and Warner Avenue

§ Remove the following from the MPSH
- Flower Street between 17th Street and its northern terminus
- Logan Street between Civic Center Drive and Santa Ana Boulevard

The majority of the proposed reclassifications aim to reduce existing rights-of-way for vehicular traffic lanes to make room for bicycle and pedestrian improvements. Landmark streets are also identified within or adjacent to the Santa Ana Downtown Historic District, which is listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

The Mobility Element update incorporates the proposed Santa Ana-Garden Grove Fixed Guideway project, which will introduce new transit service to the city. Santa Ana is working with Garden Grove and Orange County Transit Authority to build a fixed guideway system called the

OC Streetcar. Expected to begin operations in 2022, the OC Streetcar will link the Santa Ana Regional Transportation Center to a new multimodal hub at Harbor Boulevard/Westminster Avenue in Garden Grove. OC Streetcar will serve historic downtown Santa Ana and Civic Center. Along its four-mile route, OC Streetcar will connect with 18 Orange County Transit Authority bus routes and increase transportation options along Santa Ana Boulevard, 4th Street, the Pacific Electric right-of-way, and Harbor Boulevard.

Focus Areas

1. South Main Street Focus Area

The South Main Street focus area introduces the opportunity for greater flexibility and a more dynamic mix of land uses and urban design along the properties fronting Main Street. The intent is to transition an auto-dominated corridor into a transit- and pedestrian-friendly corridor through infill development without disrupting the surrounding lower-density neighborhoods. The objectives of this focus area are:

- Facilitate redevelopment and property improvements along Main Street.
- Create a more active and dynamic streetscape.
- Protect established residential neighborhoods.
- Support transit, pedestrian, and nonmotorized travel.

The majority of properties fronting Main Street will be designated Urban Neighborhood, allowing for future development to include commercial uses, low- and medium-density housing, or a combination of both in a vertically mixed-use format. South of Warner Avenue, the Industrial/Flex designation will offer new options for small-scale manufacturing, live-work, and retail opportunities.

The balance of the focus area will remain designated for Low Density Residential or Institutional to reflect the existing development patterns and land uses. New buildings and spaces will be sensitive to the surrounding low-density neighborhoods while still emphasizing the creation of active and attractive urban spaces.

2. Grand Avenue / 17th Street Focus Area

The Grand Avenue / 17th Street focus area will foster the development of an urban mixed-use corridor connecting into the city's downtown and transit core. The intent is to create opportunities for a new mix of land uses and design to transition Grand Avenue from a series of auto-oriented shopping plazas to a series of dynamic urban spaces. The objectives of this focus area are:

- Create mixed-use corridors and urban villages.
- Promote infill development while respecting established neighborhoods.
- Foster community spaces and neighborhood-serving amenities.
- Develop opportunities for live-work, artist spaces, and small-scale manufacturing.
- Maintain compatible nodes of commercial activity.

The majority of land in this focus area is planned for Urban Neighborhood or District Center land use designations, which will allow a blend of residential and commercial uses to develop simultaneously, as market conditions allow. An intense mixed-use area is envisioned adjacent to the Santa Ana Regional Transportation Center, along the east side of Grand Avenue south of I-5. This part of the focus area will support larger, more visually dynamic buildings and urban spaces that complement and benefit from the adjacent regional transit center.

North of I-5, the buildings and spaces will be sensitive to the surrounding low-density neighborhoods but will still emphasize the creation of active and attractive urban spaces. A mix of residential, retail, and office will be interspersed along the frontage of Grand Avenue, with a concentrated node of commercial and mixed-use residential uses at Grand Avenue and 17th Street. A small portion of the focus area is designated for Industrial/Flex and General Commercial to support small-scale manufacturing, live-work, and retail opportunities will be located along 17th Street near the Regional Transportation Center.

3. West Santa Ana Boulevard Focus Area

The West Santa Ana Boulevard focus area connects the Harbor Mixed Use Transit Corridor Specific Plan area and Downtown Santa Ana, and the OC Streetcar Project improvements will create the physical transit link in 2022. The intent is to transition a group of auto-oriented neighborhoods, businesses, and institutions into a series of transit-oriented neighborhoods that support and benefit from future streetcar stops. The objectives of this focus area are:

- Develop housing and mixed-use opportunities near streetcar stations.
- Promote infill development while respecting established neighborhoods.
- Buffer industrial land uses and residential neighborhoods.
- Create opportunities for clean industrial/maker-type spaces.

4. 55 Freeway / Dyer Road Focus Area

The 55 Freeway / Dyer Road focus area will transition from almost exclusively professional office to a range of commercial, industrial/flex, and mixed-use development. The intent is to create opportunities for a truly urban lifestyle with easy access to Downtown Santa Ana, multiple transit options, and the new investments and amenities in adjacent communities. The objectives of this focus area are:

- Provide housing opportunities at an urban level of intensity at the city's edge.
- Enhance opportunities for corporate offices.
- Attract economic activity into the city from surrounding communities.
- Protect industrial and office employment base.
- Maintain hotel and commercial uses.

The overall scale and experience of the focus area along the freeway and city boundary will reflect an urban intensity and design, with inspiring building forms and public spaces. At the southeastern edge, the District Center land use designation will facilitate large residential mixed-use

developments in structures that incorporate high-density housing, hotels, and complementary expansions of commercial uses. Adjacent to the 55 freeway, the Industrial/Flex land use designation will promote large-scale office-industrial flex spaces, multilevel corporate offices, and research and development uses.

The node surrounding the freeway interchange will remain as currently planned for General Commercial uses, with new improvements introducing development and spaces that complement the existing examples and elements.

South Bristol Street Focus Area

The South Bristol Street focus area represents Santa Ana's southern gateway and is a part of the South Coast Metro area. Between Sunflower and Alton Avenues, the District Center land use designation will create opportunities to transform auto-oriented shopping plazas to walkable, bike-friendly, and transit-friendly urban villages that incorporate a mix of high intensity office and residential living with experiential commercial uses. The objectives of this focus area are:

§ Capitalize on the success of the South Coast Metro area.

§ Introduce mixed-use urban villages and encourage experiential commercial uses that are more walkable, bike friendly, and transit oriented.

§ Provide for mixed-use opportunities while protecting adjacent, established, low-density neighborhoods.

Between MacArthur Boulevard and Alton Avenue, the form and intensity will scale down but remain distinctly urban in nature. The redevelopment of the auto-oriented commercial plazas will result in the construction of landmark buildings and structures set in and around spaces accessible to future occupants and the general public. The corridor north of Alton Avenue is planned with the Urban Neighborhood land use designation, allowing for commercial and residential projects, frequently in a mixed-use format, to develop in accordance with market fluctuations. The buildings and spaces in this part of the focus area will be sensitive to the surrounding low-density neighborhoods but will still emphasize the creation of active and attractive urban spaces.

Specific Plan/Special Zoning

There are seven planning areas that represent specific plans and other special zoning areas that were previously adopted: Adaptive Reuse Project Incentive Area (2014), Bristol Street Corridor Specific Plan (1991/2018), Harbor Mixed Use Transit Corridor Specific Plan (2014), MainPlace Specific Plan (2019), Metro East Mixed-Use Overlay Zone (2007/2018), Midtown Specific Plan (1996), and Transit Zoning Code Specific Development (2010). The most recent adoption/amendment date for each document is noted in parentheses.

Adaptive Reuse Project Incentive Area

The Adaptive Reuse Ordinance, Section 41-1651 of the Santa Ana Municipal Code, provides alternative building and fire standards for the conversion of eligible buildings, or portions thereof, from nonresidential uses to dwelling units, guest rooms or joint living, and work quarters. Eligible structures are buildings within the Adaptive Reuse project incentive area that were constructed in accordance with building and zoning codes in effect prior to July 1, 1974, or which have been determined to be a Historically Significant. The Project Incentive Area includes properties in the Midtown Specific Plan area; the Transit Zoning Code area; the Metro East Mixed-Use Overlay Zone; the North Main Street Corridor on both sides of Main Street, from 17th Street to the northernmost MainPlace Drive; and the East 1st Street Corridor on both sides of 1st Street from Grand Avenue to Elk Lane. Residential uses are allowed in the Project Incentive Area irrespective of the underlying zoning as part of an approved Adaptive Reuse Project.

Harbor Mixed Use Transit Corridor Specific Plan

The Harbor Mixed Use Transit Corridor Specific Plan covers the 2.5-mile segment of Harbor Boulevard on the west side of Santa Ana. The approximately 305-acre planning area includes parcels adjacent to Harbor Boulevard between Westminster Avenue and Lilac Avenue as well as parcels along Westminster Avenue, 1st Street, and 5th Street. The Harbor Mixed Use Transit Corridor Specific Plan creates the zoning necessary to take advantage of the regional and local transit investments made along and around Harbor Boulevard. The plan expands development options to include residential alongside or integrated into a mix of nonresidential uses.

MainPlace Specific Plan

The purpose of the MainPlace Specific Plan is to transform MainPlace Mall into a family - oriented retail, entertainment, and dining destination. The plan creates a mixed-use urban village with a revitalized mall at its central core. The Specific Plan area is on the north edge of Santa Ana, between Main Street on the east and SR-22 and I-5 to the north and west. The property is identified in the current General Plan land use element as District Center. The District Center designation includes the major activity areas of the city, designed to serve as anchors to the city's commercial corridors and to accommodate major development activity. No General Plan amendment is required for the specific plan, and the MainPlace Specific Plan is the zoning for the property and defines the allowable uses within its boundaries.

Metro East Mixed-Use Overlay Zone

The Metro East Mixed Use (MEMU) Overlay Zone consists of an original MEMU Overlay Zone and an expansion component. The original MEMU Overlay Zone is largely developed with commercial and office uses and comprises approximately 200 acres immediately east of the I-5 and immediately west of SR-55. It is bounded by I-5 on the west and south, Tustin Avenue on the east, and East Sixth Street on the north. The MEMU expansion area added 33.52 acres or approximately 48 parcels to the original MEMU Overlay Zone area. The additional project area

extends west primarily along First Street and is generally bounded by the I-5 to the east, Grand Avenue to the west, East Chestnut Avenue to the south, and Fourth Street to the north.

The overall objectives of the MEMU Overlay Zone are to encourage a more active commercial and residential community, provide an expanded economic base, maximize property sales tax revenues, improve the jobs/housing balance within the city, and provide for a range of housing options identified in the 2014 housing element.

Midtown Specific Plan

The Midtown Specific Plan area is generally bounded by 17th Street to the north, Civic Center Drive to the south, North Ross Street to the west, and North Spurgeon Street to the east. The Midtown area is readily accessible from the Santa Ana Freeway (I-5). Midtown is envisioned as an integrated district of civic, business, cultural, and retail activity with a small residential component.

Transit Zoning Code Specific Development

The City adopted a Transit Zoning Code to provide zoning for the integration of new infill development into existing neighborhoods; to allow for the reuse of existing structures; to provide for a range of housing options, including affordable housing; and to provide a transit-supportive, pedestrian-oriented development framework to support the addition of new transit infrastructure. The code encompasses an area in the central urban core of Santa Ana that comprises over 100 blocks and 450 acres. The area is west of I-5 and bounded by First Street on the south, Flower Street on the west, Grand Avenue on the east, and Civic Center Drive on the north.

General Plan Buildout Scenario

In general, many areas currently designated for General Commercial and Professional Office will expand opportunities for residential development by a proposed change in General Plan land use designation to Urban Neighborhood or District Center. Industrial Flex will be introduced in each of the five focus areas and replace Industrial land use designations that currently exist to allow for cleaner industrial and commercial uses with live-work opportunities.

Furthermore, state law allows a graduated density bonus for the inclusion of affordable housing units For an increasing amount of affordable units (by percentage), a project is allowed an increasing ability to exceed the permitted density (up to a cap of 35 percent). Recent updates to state housing law (Assembly Bill 1763, effective January 1, 2020), enables projects that are 100 percent affordable (either 100 percent lower income or 80 percent lower and 20 percent limited moderate), to obtain a density bonus of 80 percent, or no limit if within one-half mile of a major transit stop. However, not every proposed project pursuant to the GPU would include affordable units, and not every project that includes affordable units would need a density bonus. Proposed projects pursuant to the GPU are not required to build at densities that exceed maximum limits; the law only requires that jurisdictions grant the density bonus if requested. The buildout methodology for the GPU was based on past development trends, current development trends,

and a forecast market analysis. These trends accounted for any units approved (density bonus or otherwise), to determine the appropriate density and amount of development to assume.

Additionally, the optimal density of affordable units is at or below the density levels assumed for forecasting buildout. Generally, projects beyond 50 to 70 units per acre require Type 1 construction (steel and concrete structure), which is much more expensive than Type V construction (wood structure). Accordingly, affordable projects are rarely greater than 70 units per acre except for very small parcels. The average densities used to calculate projected buildout at 2045 are 50 to 90 units per acre in the three most intense focus areas; 55 Freeway/Dyer Road, Grand Avenue/17th Street, and South Bristol Street focus areas. For the remaining two focus areas, a residential assumption at 30 units per acre was used over a broad area to account for development at or above the maximum density of 30 units per acre. The maximum is 20 units per acre for projects proposed exclusively residential in the South Main Focus Area. The maximum is 30 units per acre for a relatively small part of the West Santa Ana Boulevard Focus Area. The City's buildout projections are therefore considered to include and account for the application of density bonus provisions of state law to future projects.

Furthermore, the potential for development in specific plan and special zoning areas is based on the forecast buildout at the time of the respective zoning document's adoption, minus the amount of new development built between the adoption date and 2019.

Growth outside of the focus areas and special planning areas is expected to be incremental and limited. Some growth was projected for the professional office surrounding the Orange County Global Medical Center and along Broadway north of the Midtown Specific Plan. Some growth was also projected for the commercial and retail area south of the West Santa Ana Boulevard focus area. Finally, some additional residential development is expected on a small portion (5 percent) of single-family and multifamily lots through the construction of second units.

For the focus areas, the forecast buildout is based on development at approximately 80 percent of the maximum allowed development for each respective land use designation.

C. DISCRETIONARY ACTIONS AND APPROVALS

Project development requires the following discretionary actions and approvals from the City:

- Adoption of the Santa Ana General Plan update
- Certification of PEIR
- Adoption of Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations
- Adoption of the Mitigation Monitoring Program
- Adoption of any ordinances, guidelines, programs, actions, or other mechanisms that implement the Santa Ana General Plan update

D. STATEMENT OF PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The updated General Plan is based on a vision statement and core values established as part of an extensive, multiyear community outreach effort. The City has identified the following core values to guide the General Plan Update (GPU):

- **Health.** The people of Santa Ana value a physical environment that encourages healthy lifestyles, a planning process that ensures that health impacts are considered, and a community that actively pursues policies and practices that improve the health of our residents.

- **Equity.** Residents value taking all necessary steps to ensure equitable outcomes, expanding access to the tools and resources that residents need, and balancing competing interests in an open and democratic manner.

- **Sustainability.** Santa Ana values land use decisions that benefit future generations, plans for the impacts of climate change, and incorporates sustainable design practices at all levels of the planning process.

- **Culture.** The Santa Ana's community values efforts that celebrate our differences as a source of strength, preserve and build upon existing cultural resources, and nurture a citywide culture of empowered residents.

- **Education.** Santa Ana values the creation of lifelong learners, the importance of opening up educational opportunities to all residents, and investing in educational programs that advance residents' economic well-being.

These core values were used as the basis to define more specific project objectives to aid decision makers in their review of the GPU and associated environmental impacts. The objectives include:

1. Promote infill development while respecting and protecting established neighborhoods.

2. Optimize high density residential and mixed-use development that maximizes potential use of mass transit.

3. Provide locations for new housing development that maximizes affordable housing opportunities to achieve both City and regional housing goals.

4. Facilitate new development at intensities sufficient to generate community benefits and attract economic activity.

5. Provide housing and employment opportunities at an urban level of intensity at the City's edge.

6. Introduce mixed-use urban villages and encourage experiential commercial uses that are more walkable, bike-friendly, and transit-oriented.

7. Develop opportunities for live/work, artist spaces, and small-scale manufacturing.

III. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW AND PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PROCESS

In conformance with CEQA, the State CEQA Guidelines, and the City of Santa Ana CEQA Guidelines, the City conducted an extensive environmental review of the proposed project.

§ The City of Santa Ana concluded that a PEIR should be prepared, and the Notice of Preparation (NOP) was released for a 30-day public review period from February 26, 2020, through March 27, 2020. The NOP was posted at the Orange County Clerk's Office on February 26, 2020. The notice was published in the *Orange County Register*, a newspaper of general circulation. Under CEQA, a lead agency may proceed directly with preparation of a PEIR without preparation of an Initial Study if it is clear that a PEIR will be required (State CEQA Guidelines § 15060[d]). The City of Santa Ana made such a determination for this project and did not prepare an Initial Study.

§ Completion of a scoping process, in which the public was invited by the City of Santa Ana to participate. The scoping meeting for the PEIR was held on March 5, 2020, at 6:00 p.m. at the Santa Ana Police Community Room at 60 Civic Center Plaza in Santa Ana. The notice of a public scoping meeting was included in the NOP distributed on February 26, 2020.

§ Preparation of a Draft PEIR by the City of Santa Ana, which was made available for a 45- day public review period (August 3, 2020, through September 16, 2020) and extended to October 6, 2020. The Notice of Availability (NOA) for the Draft PEIR was sent to all persons, agencies, and organizations on the list interested persons, sent to the State Clearinghouse in Sacramento for distribution to public agencies, and published in the August 3, 2020, *Orange County Register*. The NOA was posted at the Orange County Clerk's Office on August 3, 2020. Copies of the Draft PEIR were made available for public review at the City of Santa Ana, Planning Division Counter at 20 Civic Center Plaza, M-20, Santa Ana, CA 92701, and the City of Santa Ana Public Library at 26 Civic Center Plaza, Santa Ana, CA 92701. The Draft EIR was also available for review and download on City website: https://www.santa-ana.org/general-plan.

§ The Final PEIR contains comments on the Draft PEIR, responses to those comments, revisions to the Draft PEIR, if any, and appended documents. The Final PEIR was released for a 10-day agency review period prior to certification of the Final PEIR.

§ After considering the PEIR and in conjunction with making these findings, the City of Santa Ana hereby finds that, pursuant to Section 15092 of the CEQA Guidelines, approval of the project will result in significant effects on the environment; however, the significant effects will be eliminated or substantially lessened where feasible, and the City has determined that remaining significant effects are acceptable under Section 15093.

§ The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program is hereby adopted to ensure implementation of feasible mitigation measures identified in the PEIR. The City of Santa Ana finds that these mitigation measures are fully enforceable conditions on the project and shall be binding upon the City and affected parties.

§ The City of Santa Ana finds that the project is in the public interest and is necessary for the public health, safety, and welfare.

§ The City of Santa Ana hereby certifies the Final PEIR in accordance with the requirements of CEQA.

§ Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15095, staff is directed as follows: a) copy of the Final PEIR and CEQA Findings of Fact shall be retained in the project files; b) copy of the Final PEIR and CEQA Findings of Fact shall be provided to the project applicant who is responsible for providing copy of same to all CEQA "responsible" agencies.

IV. ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES THAT WERE DETERMINED NOT TO BE POTENTIALLY AFFECTED BY THE PROPOSED PROJECT

A. IMPACTS DETERMINED TO BE LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT DURING THE SCOPING PROCESS

Based on the public scoping process (including review of NOP responses and input at the public scoping meeting), in addition to analysis prepared for the Draft PEIR, the City determined, based upon the threshold criteria for significance, that the project would have no impact or a less than significant impact on the following potential environmental issues (see Draft PEIR, Chapter 8, Impacts Found Not to Be Significant). It was determined, therefore, that these potential environmental issues would be precluded from detailed discussion in the Draft PEIR. Based upon the environmental analysis presented in the Draft PEIR, and the comments received by the public on the Draft PEIR, no substantial evidence was submitted to or identified by the City which indicated that the project would have an impact on the following environmental areas:

(a) **Agriculture and Forestry Resources:** The City does not have any significant agricultural resources. Additionally, Santa Ana has no land designated or zoned for agricultural use and does not have any land subject to a Williamson Act contract. Santa Ana does not have any land designated or zoned for forestland, timberland, or zoned Timberland Production.

(b) **Wildfire:** According to CAL FIRE, the nearest fire hazard severity zone (FHSZ) in an SRA to the City of Santa Ana is a high FHSZ about 4.0 miles east along the western edge of Loma Ridge. The nearest FHSZ in an LRA is about 3.8 miles away at the southern tip of the Peters Canyon Regional Park. The city is not in or near SRAs or lands classified as very high FHSZs. Additionally, no area in the city is on the wildland-urban interface.

All other topical areas of evaluation included in the Environmental Checklist were determined to require further assessment in the Draft PEIR.

B. IMPACTS DETERMINED TO BE LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IN THE DRAFT PEIR

This section identifies impacts of the proposed project determined to be less than significant without implementation of project-specific mitigation measures. This determination, however, does assume compliance with existing regulations, as detailed in each respective topical section of Chapter 5 in the Draft PEIR.

(a) **Aesthetics:** Buildout under the GPU will be at a greater intensity/density in all five focus areas compared to existing conditions. While maximum height would generally be similar to existing buildings, the overall increase in allowed intensity and height across the focus areas would lead to a visually denser urban setting and alter Santa Ana's existing skyline. Buildout under the GPU would not have a substantial adverse effect on scenic vistas (such as the Santa Ana River and Santiago Creek) since these existing open space parcels would remain unchanged. Additionally, no state scenic highways, eligible or officially designated, traverse the city nor are located near the city. Therefore, the GPU would not damage scenic resources, including rock outcroppings, trees, and historic buildings within state scenic

highways. The GPU would also create new sources of light or glare in the project area, but adverse impacts would be minimized with compliance to building codes.

(b) **Biological Resources:** Development pursuant to the GPU would not impact riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities. Additionally, the GPU would not impact wetlands and jurisdictional waterways. The GPU would not conflict with an adopted NCCP/HCP as the City is not within a NCCP/HCP area and would not conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources.

(c) **Cultural Resources:** The likelihood that human remains may be discovered during clearing and grading activities is considered extremely low. In the unlikely event human remains are uncovered, impacts would be less than significant upon compliance with California and Safety Code Section 7050.5.

(d) **Energy:** Implementation of proposed policies under the GPU, in conjunction with and complementary to regulatory requirements, will ensure that energy demand associated with growth under the GPU would not be inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary. Additionally, the GPU would not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.

(e) **Geology and Soils:** The plan area's location and underlying geology make it likely to experience seismic hazards, including strong seismic ground shaking, and secondary hazards, like liquefaction. No active surface faults are mapped and zoned under the AP Zoning Act in the plan area. Additionally, all structures that would be constructed in accordance with the GPU would be designed to meet or exceed current design standards as found in the latest CBC. Most of the plan area is within an area susceptible to liquefaction; however, all structures constructed under the GPU would be designed in accordance with current seismic design standards as found in the CBC. There are no substantial hazards with respect to slope stability, as the plan area is mostly flat. Unstable geologic unit or soils conditions, including soil erosion, could result from development of the GPU. Mandatory compliance with existing regulations, including the preparation and submittal of a SWPPP and a soil engineering evaluation, would reduce soil erosion impacts to a less than significant level. Implementation of the CBC design code, which has been adopted by the City and requires that structures be designed to mitigate expansive and compressible soils, would reduce impacts to a less than significant level. The probability of subsidence impacts is generally low in the majority of Santa Ana; however, the statutorily required sustainable groundwater management practices of the Orange County Water District would ensure that impacts would be less than significant. Future development in the plan area would require connection to the City's sewer system as the City of Santa Ana does not allow for the installation of septic tanks.

(f) **Greenhouse Gas Emissions:** The GPU would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs.

(g) **Hazards and Hazardous Materials:** Construction and operations under the GPU would involve the transport, use, and/or disposal of hazardous materials; however, compliance with existing regulations would ensure that construction workers and the general public are not exposed to any risks related to hazardous materials during demolition and construction. Furthermore, strict adherence to all emergency response plan requirements set by the Orange County Fire Authority would be required throughout the duration of project construction. GPU buildout is expected to result in some increase in the number of hazardous waste generators; however, hazardous wastes would be stored, transported, and disposed of in conformance with existing regulations of the EPA, US Department of Transportation, CalRecycle, and other agencies. Use, storage, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials in conformance with regulations would reduce both the likelihood of an accidental release and the potential consequences in the event of an accidental release.

The plan area includes 555 sites on a list of hazardous materials compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 that could create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. Any development, redevelopment, or reuse on or next to any of these sites would require environmental site assessment by a qualified environmental professional to ensure that the project would not disturb hazardous materials on any of the hazardous materials sites or plumes of hazardous materials diffusing from one of the hazardous materials sites, and that any proposed development, redevelopment, or reuse would not create a substantial hazard to the public or the environment.

Santa Ana is in the vicinity of an airport or within the jurisdiction of an airport land use plan. Projects approved under the proposed GPU would be required to comply with FAA airspace protection regulations using the AELUP consistency determination process.

The buildout of the GPU would not result in substantial changes to the circulation patterns or emergency access routes, and would not block or otherwise interfere with use of evacuation routes. Buildout would not interfere with operation of the City's Emergency Operations Center and would not interfere with operations of emergency response agencies or with coordination and cooperation between such agencies.

Santa Ana is not in a designated fire hazard zone, and implementation of the GPU will not expose structures and/or residences to wildland fire danger.

(h) **Hydrology and Water Quality:** Projects pursuant to the GPU would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality. Development pursuant to the GPU would increase the demand on groundwater use but would not impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin. Development pursuant to the GPU would increase the amount of pervious surfaces in the plan area, but could substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in some focus areas in a manner which would result in flooding off-site or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems. In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, development pursuant to the GPU would not risk release of pollutants due to project inundation or impede or redirect flood flows. Development

pursuant to the GPU would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan.

(i) **Land Use Planning:** Implementation of the GPU would not divide an established community. Additionally, the GPU would be consistent with the Airport Environs Land Use Plan for the John Wayne Airport. Implementation of the GPU would be consistent with the goals of the Southern California Association of Governments' RTP/SCS. Implementation of the GPU would also be consistent with the OCTA Congestion Management Plan.

(j) **Mineral Resources:** Project implementation would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource.

(k) **Noise:** The proximity of the plan area to an airport or airstrip would not result in exposure of future residents and/or workers to excessive airport-related noise.

(l) **Population and Housing:** The proposed GPU would provide more housing opportunities than currently exist. Therefore, implementation of the GPU would not displace people and/or housing.

(m) **Public Services:** The GPU would introduce new structures and allow for up to 22,361 new residents and workers in the OCFA and Santa Ana Police Department service boundaries, thereby increasing the requirement for fire protection facilities and personnel, as well as increasing the service needs for the Main Library and the Newhope Library Learning Center. The GPU would also generate additional students who would impact the school enrollment capacities of the Santa Ana Unified School District, Garden Grove Unified School District, and Orange Unified School District. However, upon implementation of regulatory requirements and standard conditions of approval the project would not create significant impacts related to fire protection services, police protection, library services, or school services.

(n) **Recreation:** The GPU would generate additional residents that would increase the use of existing park and recreational facilities. However, upon implementation of regulatory requirements and standard conditions of approval, impacts would not be significant. Project implementation would result in environmental impacts to provide new and/or expanded recreational facilities, but potentially adverse impacts to the environment that may result from the expansion of parks, recreational facilities, and multiuse trails pursuant to buildout of the proposed land use plan would be less than significant upon the implementation of the GPU's goals, policies, and actions and existing federal, state, and local regulations. Subsequent environmental review for future individual park developments would also be required.

(o) **Transportation and Traffic:** The GPU is consistent with adopted programs, plans, and policies addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities. Additionally, GPU implementation would result in a reduction of vehicle miles traveled per service population (VMT/SP) in comparison to existing City conditions, and would achieve a VMT/SP at least 15 percent lower than the countywide VMT/SP. Finally,

circulation improvements associated with future development that would be accommodated by the GPU would be designed to adequately address potentially hazardous conditions (sharp curves, etc.), potential conflicting uses, and emergency access.

(p) **Utilities and Service Systems:** Development pursuant to the GPU would require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded wastewater facilities. However, Orange County Sanitation District (OCSD) has a functioning and effective process in place to ensure the regional sewer infrastructure will support future developments under the Santa Ana GPU. Additionally, OCSD and OC Water District have adequate capacity to serve development pursuant to the GPU in addition to the providers existing commitments. Development pursuant to the GPU would require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water facilities. However, the City would have adequate capacity for the proposed increases in water flows across the city under implementation of the GPU and would be able to serve the additional dwelling units and commercial square footage proposed. Furthermore, GPU policies encourage the maintenance and upgrade of water infrastructure through impact fees from new development, and the exploration of other funding sources. Water supply would be adequate to meet development pursuant to the GPU. Existing and/or proposed stormwater drainage facilities would be able to accommodate proposed development pursuant to the GPU. Existing and/or proposed solid waste facilities would be able to accommodate development pursuant to the GPU and comply with related solid waste regulations. Development pursuant to the GPU would require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded electric power and natural gas. However, the net increases in natural gas demands due to the GPU buildout are within the amounts that SoCalGas forecasts that it will supply to its customers, and buildout would not require SoCalGas to obtain increased natural gas supplies over its currently forecast supplies.

V. FINDINGS REGARDING POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

The following potentially significant environmental impacts were analyzed in the Draft PEIR, and the effects of the project were considered. Because of environmental analysis of the project and the identification of relevant General Plan policies; compliance with existing laws, codes, and statutes; and the identification of feasible mitigation measures, some potentially significant impacts have been determined by the City to be reduced to a level of less than significant, and the City has found—in accordance with CEQA Section 21081(a)(1) and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a) (1)—that "Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment." This is referred to herein as "**Finding 1**."

Where the City has determined—pursuant to CEQA Section 21081(a)(2) and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(2)—that "Those changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and have been, or can and should be, adopted by that other agency," the City's finding is referred to herein as "**Finding 2**."

Where, as a result of the environmental analysis of the project, the City has determined that either (1) even with the identification of project design features, compliance with existing laws, codes and statutes, and/or the identification of feasible mitigation measures, potentially significant impacts cannot be reduced to a level of less than significant, or (2) no feasible mitigation measures or alternatives are available to mitigate the potentially significant impact, the City has found in accordance with CEQA Section 21081(a)(3) and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(3) that "Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or alternatives identified in the environmental impact report." This is referred to herein as "**Finding 3**."

A. IMPACTS MITIGATED TO LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT

The following summary describes impacts of the proposed project that, without mitigation, would result in significant adverse impacts. Upon implementation of the mitigation measures provided in the Draft PEIR, the impacts would be considered less than significant.

1. Air Quality

Impact 5.2-6: Industrial land uses accommodated under the General Plan update could create other emissions, such as those leading to objectionable odors, that would adversely affect a substantial number of people.

Industrial land uses associated with the GPU may generate potentially significant odor impacts for a substantial number of people. Impacts from potential odors generated from residential and other nonresidential land uses associated with the GPU are considered less than significant. Impacts associated with construction-generated odors are considered less than significant.

The Industrial and Industrial Flex land uses are not anticipated to produce odors, and Mitigation Measure AQ-4 would ensure that odor impacts are minimized and facilities would comply with South Coast AQMD Rule 402. Therefore, Impact 5.2-6 would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

AQ-4 Prior to discretionary approval by the City of Santa Ana, if it is determined that a development project has the potential to emit nuisance odors beyond the property line, an odor management plan shall be prepared by the project applicant and submitted to the City of Santa Ana for review and approval. Facilities that have the potential to generate nuisance odors include, but are not limited to:

- Wastewater treatment plants
- Composting, green waste, or recycling facilities
- Fiberglass manufacturing facilities
- Painting/coating operations
- Large-capacity coffee roasters
- Food-processing facilities

The odor management plan shall demonstrate compliance with the South Coast Air Quality Management District's Rule 402 for nuisance odors. The Odor Management Plan shall identify the best available control technologies for toxics (T-BACTs) that will be utilized to reduce potential odors to acceptable levels, including appropriate enforcement mechanisms. T-BACTs may include but are not limited to scrubbers (i.e., air pollution control devices) at the industrial facility. T-BACTs identified in the odor management plan shall be identified as mitigation measures in the environmental document prepared for the development project and/or incorporated into the project's site plan.

Finding

Finding 1. The City hereby makes Finding 1. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Draft PEIR. These changes are identified in the form of the mitigation measure above. The City of Santa Ana hereby finds that implementation of the mitigation measure is feasible, and the measure is therefore adopted.

2. Biological Resources

Impact 5.3-1: Implementation of the General Plan Update could result in adverse impacts to candidate, sensitive, or special-status species.

The inventory of existing conditions determined that no parcels with a proposed land use designation that allows for development (i.e., not an open space designation) currently has

sensitive vegetation. All parcels currently have ruderal vegetation and little to no biological value. Therefore, there is no current indication that future development in accordance with the GPU would have significant unavoidable biological impacts. However, the programmatic analysis prepared for this GPU was not at the detailed, site-specific analysis required for a specific development project. Site-specific analyses could reveal biological resources not identified in the Biological and Natural Resources Report. Therefore, there is a potential for biological impacts associated with implementation of the GPU. Therefore, implementation of the GPU could result in a potentially significant impact.

The letter received from CDFW states that the Santa Ana River and its tributaries historically supported federally endangered southern California steelhead. CDFW's letter requests that the Draft Program EIR include an analysis of any proposed major stream crossings in the context of fish passage, and states that the analysis should include, but not be limited to, steelhead presence or historic presence, existing conditions including habitat and barrier assessments, any known projects to remove barriers or restore habitat that would affect or be affected by this project, and cumulative impacts to steelhead populations and/or habitat resulting from this project. The GPU does not propose any major stream crossings. If any future development project entails improvements for stream crossings (e.g. Santa Ana River and Santiago Creek), project-level CEQA compliance would require a biological resources report that would address potential impacts to endangered species, including the California steelhead.

Impact 5.3-1 would be less than significant with compliance with all applicable federal, state, and local regulations and incorporation of mitigation measure BIO-1.

Mitigation Measures

BIO-1 For development or redevelopment projects that would disturb vegetated land or major stream and are subject to CEQA, a qualified biologist shall conduct an initial screening to determine whether a site-specific biological resource report is warranted. If needed, a qualified biologist shall conduct a field survey for the site and prepare a biological resource assessment for the project, including an assessment of potential impacts to sensitive species, habitats, and jurisdictional waters. The report shall recommend mitigation measures, as appropriate, to avoid or limit potential biological resource impacts to less than significant.

Finding

Finding 1. The City hereby makes Finding 1. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Draft PEIR. These changes are identified in the form of the mitigation measures above. The City of Santa Ana hereby finds that implementation of the mitigation measure is feasible, and the measure is therefore adopted.

Impact 5.3-4: Implementation of the General Plan Update could result in adverse impacts to candidate, sensitive, or special-status species.

The City of Santa Ana is largely urbanized, and migration corridors are generally limited to the Santa Ana River and the Santiago Creek. Development under the GPU would result in the further infill of the city and removal of vacant sites. The GPU would not change land use designations of parcels that encompass the Santa Ana River or the Santiago Creek. However, development under the GPU could further result in vegetation removal, intrusion by humans and pets, and increased noise and air pollutants, which could impact wildlife movement and nesting sites. Therefore, the buildout of the GPU could affect wildlife movement, nesting sites, and migratory birds protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act as well as state law.

Impact 5.3-4 would be less than significant with compliance with all applicable federal, state, and local regulations and incorporation of mitigation measure BIO-1.

Mitigation Measures

Refer to BIO-1 above.

Finding

Finding 1. The City hereby makes Finding 1. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Draft PEIR. These changes are identified in the form of the mitigation measure above. The City of Santa Ana hereby finds that implementation of the mitigation measure is feasible, and the measure is therefore adopted.

3. Cultural Resources

Impact 5.4-2: Development in accordance with the General Plan Update could impact archaeological resources.

Development involving ground disturbance within the plan area has the potential to impact known and unknown archaeological resources. Typically, surface-level and subsurface archaeological sites and deposits can be affected by ground-disturbing activities associated with most types of construction. Based on literature review and records searches, eight archaeological resources have been recorded within the plan area, including four prehistoric sites, one multicomponent site, and three historic isolates. The plan area includes many locations that would have been favorable for prehistoric Native American occupation. While most of the plan area has been developed over the course of the twentieth century, buried resources may remain in areas where developments such as parking lots, parks, or structures with shallow foundations have required only minimal ground disturbance. A review of historical and ethnographic maps indicates a moderate likelihood that intact subsurface archaeological resources would be encountered during redevelopment.

Archaeological resources impacts are site specific, but more intensive development can result in cumulative impacts on a regional level and should be considered in addition to individual project

impacts on individual sites. As determined by the respective lead agency on a project by project basis, Phase I Cultural Resources studies would be required before ground disturbances and demolition activities are permitted to occur. The study would identify resources on the affected project sites that are, or appear to be, eligible for listing on the National or California Register. Such studies would also recommend mitigation measures to protect and preserve archaeological and tribal cultural resources.

Mitigation Measures CUL-4 through CUL-7 were developed to reduce potential individual and cumulative impacts associated with future development and redevelopment. Mitigation Measure CUL-4 requires an archaeological resources assessment be conducted for future development projects to identify any known archaeological resources and sensitivity of the site. Mitigation Measures CUL-5 through CUL-7 detail the next steps required should the archaeological resources assessment identify known resources or determine the site to have high or moderate resource sensitivity. Upon compliance with Mitigation Measures CUL-4 through CUL-7, individual and cumulative impacts to archaeological resources would be reduced to less than significant levels.

Mitigation Measures

CUL-4 For projects with ground disturbance—e.g., grading, excavation, trenching, boring, or demolition that extend below the current grade—prior to issuance of any permits required to conduct ground-disturbing activities, the City shall require an Archaeological Resources Assessment be conducted under the supervision of an archaeologist that meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professionally Qualified Standards in either prehistoric or historic archaeology.

Assessments shall include a California Historical Resources Information System records search at the South Central Coastal Information Center and of the Sacred Land Files maintained by the Native American Heritage Commission. The records searches will determine if the proposed project area has been previously surveyed for archaeological resources, identify and characterize the results of previous cultural resource surveys, and disclose any cultural resources that have been recorded and/or evaluated. If unpaved surfaces are present within the project area, and the entire project area has not been previously surveyed within the past 10 years, a Phase I pedestrian survey shall be undertaken in proposed project areas to locate any surface cultural materials that may be present.

CUL-5 If potentially significant archaeological resources are identified, and impacts cannot be avoided, a Phase II Testing and Evaluation investigation shall be performed by an archaeologist who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards to determine significance prior to any ground-disturbing activities. If resources are determined significant or unique through Phase II testing, and site avoidance is not possible, appropriate site-specific mitigation measures shall be undertaken. These might include a Phase III data recovery program implemented by a qualified archaeologist

and performed in accordance with the Office of Historical Preservation's "Archaeological Resource Management Reports (ARMR): Recommended Contents and Format" (OHP 1990) and "Guidelines for Archaeological Research Designs" (OHP 1991).

CUL-6 If the archaeological assessment did not identify archaeological resources but found the area to be highly sensitive for archaeological resources, a qualified archaeologist shall monitor all ground-disturbing construction and pre-construction activities in areas with previously undisturbed soil. The archaeologist shall inform all construction personnel prior to construction activities of the proper procedures in the event of an archaeological discovery. The training shall be held in conjunction with the project's initial on-site safety meeting and shall explain the importance and legal basis for the protection of significant archaeological resources. In the event that archaeological resources (artifacts or features) are exposed during ground-disturbing activities, construction activities in the immediate vicinity of the discovery shall be halted while the resources are evaluated for significance by an archaeologist who meets the Secretary's Standards, and tribal consultation shall be conducted in the case of a tribal resource. If the discovery proves to be significant, the long-term disposition of any collected materials should be determined in consultation with the affiliated tribe(s), where relevant; this could include curation with a recognized scientific or educational repository, transfer to the tribe, or respectful reinternment in an area designated by the tribe.

CUL-7 If an Archaeological Resources Assessment does not identify potentially significant archaeological resources but the site has moderate sensitivity for archaeological resources (Mitigation Measure CUL-4), an archaeologist who meets the Secretary's Standards shall be retained on call. The archaeologist shall inform all construction personnel prior to construction activities about the proper procedures in the event of an archaeological discovery. The pre-construction training shall be held in conjunction with the project's initial on-site safety meeting and shall explain the importance and legal basis for the protection of significant archaeological resources. In the event that archaeological resources (artifacts or features) are exposed during ground-disturbing activities, construction activities in the immediate vicinity of the discovery shall be halted while the on-call archaeologist is contacted. The resource shall be evaluated for significance and tribal consultation shall be conducted, in the case of a tribal resource. If the discovery proves to be significant, the long-term disposition of any collected materials should be determined in consultation with the affiliated tribe(s), where relevant.

Finding

Finding 1. The City hereby makes Finding 1. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Draft PEIR. These changes are identified in the form of the mitigation

measures above. The City of Santa Ana hereby finds that implementation of the mitigation measures is feasible, and the measures are therefore adopted.

4. Geology and Soils

Impact 5.6-4: Future development that would be accommodated by the General Plan Update could impact known and unknown paleontological resources.

Paleontological resources are recognized as nonrenewable and therefore receive protection under the California Public Resources Code and CEQA. Adoption of the GPU in itself will not directly affect paleontological resources. Long-term implementation of the GPU land use plan could allow development (e.g., infill development, redevelopment, and revitalization/restoration), including grading, of known and unknown sensitive areas. Grading and construction activities of undeveloped areas or redevelopment that requires more intensive soil excavation than in the past could potentially disturb paleontological resources. Therefore, future development that would be accommodated by the GPU could potentially unearth previously unrecorded resources. Review and protection of paleontological resources are also afforded by CEQA for individual development projects that would be accommodated by the GPU, subject to discretionary actions that are implemented in accordance with the land use plan of the GPU. Fossil localities have been found in the vicinity of the plan area, although not in the plan area itself.

Mitigation Measures GEO-1 through GEO-3 prescribe requirements for monitoring based on the sensitivity of sites for paleontological resources. Under GEO-1, areas that range from high to low sensitivity are required to prepare a Paleontological Resources Monitoring and Mitigation Plan. With adherence to mitigation measures GEO-1 through GEO-3, Impact 5.6-4 would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

GEO-1 **High Sensitivity.** Projects involving ground disturbances in previously undisturbed areas mapped as having “high” paleontological sensitivity shall be monitored by a qualified paleontological monitor on a full-time basis. Monitoring shall include inspection of exposed sedimentary units during active excavations within sensitive geologic sediments. The monitor shall have authority to temporarily divert activity away from exposed fossils to evaluate the significance of the find and, if the fossils are determined to be significant, professionally and efficiently recover the fossil specimens and collect associated data. The paleontological monitor shall use field data forms to record pertinent location and geologic data, measure stratigraphic sections (if applicable), and collect appropriate sediment samples from any fossil localities.

GEO-2 **Low-to-High Sensitivity.** Prior to issuance of a grading permit for projects involving ground disturbance in previously undisturbed areas mapped with “low-to-high” paleontological sensitivity, the project applicant shall consult with a geologist or paleontologist to confirm whether the grading would occur at depths that could encounter highly sensitive sediments for paleontological resources. If confirmed that

underlying sediments may have high sensitivity, construction activity shall be monitored by a qualified paleontologist. The paleontologist shall have the authority to halt construction during construction activity as outlined in Mitigation Measure GEO-3.

GEO-3 **All Projects.** In the event of any fossil discovery, regardless of depth or geologic formation, construction work shall halt within a 50-foot radius of the find until its significance can be determined by a qualified paleontologist. Significant fossils shall be recovered, prepared to the point of curation, identified by qualified experts, listed in a database to facilitate analysis, and deposited in a designated paleontological curation facility in accordance with the standards of the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology (2010). The most likely repository is the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County. The repository shall be identified and a curatorial arrangement shall be signed prior to collection of the fossils.

Finding

Finding 1. The City hereby makes Finding 1. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Draft PEIR. These changes are identified in the form of the mitigation measures above. The City of Santa Ana hereby finds that implementation of the mitigation measures is feasible, and the measures are therefore adopted.

5. Noise

Impact 5.12-3: Buildout of the individual land uses and projects for implementation of the GPU may expose sensitive uses to excessive levels of groundborne vibration.

Construction Vibration Impacts. Construction activity at projects within the plan area would generate varying degrees of ground vibration, depending on the construction procedures and equipment. Operation of construction equipment generates vibrations that spread through the ground and diminish with distance from the source. The effect on buildings in the vicinity of the construction site varies depending on soil type, ground strata, and receptor-building construction. The results from vibration can range from no perceptible effects at the lowest vibration levels, to low rumbling sounds and perceptible vibrations at moderate levels, to slight structural damage at the highest levels. Vibration from construction activities rarely reaches the levels that can damage structures but can achieve the audible and perceptible ranges in buildings close to the construction site.

Vibration generated by construction equipment has the potential to be substantial, since it has the potential to exceed the FTA criteria for architectural damage (e.g., 0.12 inches per second [in/sec] PPV for fragile or historical resources, 0.2 in/sec PPV for non-engineered timber and masonry buildings, and 0.3 in/sec PPV for engineered concrete and masonry). Construction details and equipment for future project-level developments under the GPU are not known at this time but may cause vibration impacts.

With implementation of Mitigation Measures N-2, N-3, and N-4, coupled with adherence to associated performance standards, Impact 5.12-3 would be reduced to less-than-significant levels. Specifically, Mitigation Measure N-2 would reduce potential vibration impacts during construction below the pertinent thresholds, and Mitigation Measures N-3 and N-4 (operations-related vibration) would reduce potential vibration impacts from commercial/industrial uses and proposed uses near existing railroads and facilities to less-than-significant levels. No significant and unavoidable vibration impacts would remain.

Operational Vibration Impacts. Commercial and industrial operations within the plan area would generate varying degrees of ground vibration, depending on the operational procedures and equipment. Such equipment-generated vibrations would spread through the ground and diminish with distance from the source. The effect on buildings in the vicinity of the vibration source varies depending on soil type, ground strata, and receptor-building construction. The results from vibration can range from no perceptible effects at the lowest vibration levels, to low rumbling sounds and perceptible vibrations at moderate levels, to slight structural damage at the highest levels. In addition, future sensitive receptors could be placed within close proximity to existing railroad lines through buildout in the plan area.

Because specific project-level information is not available at this time, it is not possible to quantify future vibration levels at vibration-sensitive receptors that may be near existing and future vibration sources.

With implementation of Mitigation Measures N-2, N-3, and N-4, coupled with adherence to associated performance standards, Impact 5.12-3 would be reduced to less-than-significant levels. Specifically, Mitigation Measure N-2 would reduce potential vibration impacts during construction below the pertinent thresholds, and Mitigation Measures N-3 and N-4 (operations-related vibration) would reduce potential vibration impacts from commercial/industrial uses and proposed uses near existing railroads and facilities to less-than-significant levels. No significant and unavoidable vibration impacts would remain.

Mitigation Measures

N-2 Prior to issuance of a building permit for a project requiring pile driving during construction within 135 feet of fragile structures, such as historical resources, 100 feet of non-engineered timber and masonry buildings (e.g., most residential buildings), or within 75 feet of engineered concrete and masonry (no plaster); or a vibratory roller within 25 feet of any structure, the project applicant shall prepare a noise and vibration analysis to assess and mitigate potential noise and vibration impacts related to these activities. This noise and vibration analysis shall be conducted by a qualified and experienced acoustical consultant or engineer. The vibration levels shall not exceed Federal Transit Administration (FTA) architectural damage thresholds (e.g., 0.12 inches per second [in/sec] peak particle velocity [PPV] for fragile or historical resources, 0.2 in/sec PPV for non-engineered timber and masonry buildings, and 0.3 in/sec PPV for engineered concrete and masonry). If vibration levels would exceed

this threshold, alternative uses such as drilling piles as opposed to pile driving and static rollers as opposed to vibratory rollers shall be used. If necessary, construction vibration monitoring shall be conducted to ensure vibration thresholds are not exceeded.

N-3 New residential projects (or other noise-sensitive uses) located within 200 feet of existing railroad lines shall be required to conduct a groundborne vibration and noise evaluation consistent with Federal Transit Administration (FTA)-approved methodologies.

N-4 During the project-level California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) process for industrial developments under the General Plan Update or other projects that could generate substantial vibration levels near sensitive uses, a noise and vibration analysis shall be conducted to assess and mitigate potential noise and vibration impacts related to the operations of that individual development. This noise and vibration analysis shall be conducted by a qualified and experienced acoustical consultant or engineer and shall follow the latest CEQA guidelines, practices, and precedents.

Finding

Finding 1. The City hereby makes Finding 1. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Draft PEIR. These changes are identified in the form of the mitigation measures above. The City of Santa Ana hereby finds that implementation of the mitigation measures is feasible, and the measures are therefore adopted.

6. Tribal Cultural Resources

Impact 5.17-1: The proposed project could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource that is listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k).

The Sacred Land File search yielded positive results, indicating that known tribal resources exist within the plan area. Further, a CHRIS records search at SCCIC indicates that 23 archaeological resources were previously recorded within 0.5 mile of the plan area. Of these resources, eight archaeological resources were located within the plan area; these include four prehistoric sites with habitation debris and lithic scatters, one multicomponent site, and three historic isolates. The plan area includes many locations that would have been favorable for prehistoric Native American occupation. While the city is urbanized and most of the plan area has been developed, buried resources may remain in areas of minimal ground disturbance, such as parks, parking lots, and structures with shallow foundations. Tribal cultural resources are site specific in nature.

Implementation of Mitigation Measures CUL-4 through CUL-7 would reduce impacts relating to tribal cultural resources to less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

Refer to Mitigation Measures CUL-4 through CUL-7 in section A.3, above.

Finding

Finding 1. The City hereby makes Finding 1. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Draft PEIR. These changes are identified in the form of the mitigation measures above. The City of Santa Ana hereby finds that implementation of the mitigation measures is feasible, and the measures are therefore adopted.

Impact 5.17-2: The proposed project could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource that is determined by the lead agency to be significant pursuant to criteria in Public Resources Code Section 5024.1(c).

Future development as a result of the implementation of the GPU could include grading in portions of the City with sensitivity to tribal cultural resources. Grading and construction activities that require more intensive soil excavation than in the past could potentially cause disturbance to tribal cultural resources. Future development could potentially unearth previously unknown or unrecorded tribal cultural resources.

Because the NAHC SLF search yielded positive results and the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation identified sensitive areas within the city, the buildout of the GPU may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of tribal cultural resources. Earthwork activities may occur with buildout under the GPU that could impact previously undisturbed tribal cultural resources.

Implementation of Mitigation Measures CUL-4 through CUL-7 would reduce impacts relating to tribal cultural resources to less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

Refer to Mitigation Measures CUL-4 through CUL-7 in section A.3, above.

Finding

Finding 1. The City hereby makes Finding 1. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Draft PEIR. These changes are identified in the form of the mitigation measures above. The City of Santa Ana hereby finds that implementation of the mitigation measures is feasible, and the measures are therefore adopted.

B. SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE IMPACTS

The following summary describes the unavoidable adverse impact of the GPU where mitigation measures were found to be either infeasible or would not lessen impacts to less than significant. The following impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

1. Air Quality

Impact 5.2-1: The additional population growth forecast for the General Plan Update and the associated emissions would not be consistent with the assumptions of the air quality management plan.

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.2, Air Quality, starting on page 5.2-28 of the Draft PEIR.

The GPU would be inconsistent with the South Coast Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) because buildout under the GPU would exceed the population estimates assumed for the AQMP and would cumulatively contribute to the nonattainment designations of the South Coast Air Basin (SoCAB). Buildout of the GPU would exceed current population estimates for the city, and therefore the emissions associated with the additional population are not included in the current regional emissions inventory for the SoCAB. Additionally, air pollutant emissions associated with buildout of the GPU would cumulatively contribute to the nonattainment designations in the SoCAB. Therefore, overall, the GPU would be inconsistent with the AQMP.

Incorporation of Mitigation Measure AQ-2 into future development projects for the operation phase would contribute to reduced criteria air pollutant emissions associated with buildout of the GPU. Additionally, goals and policies in the GPU would promote increased capacity for alternative transportation modes and implementation of transportation demand management strategies. However, due to the magnitude and scale of the land uses that would be developed, no mitigation measures are available that would reduce operation and construction impacts below South Coast AQMD thresholds. In addition, the population and employment assumptions of the AQMP would continue to be exceeded until the AQMP is revised and incorporates the projections of the GPU. Therefore, Impact 5.2-1 would remain significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measure

AQ-2 Prior to discretionary approval by the City of Santa Ana for development projects subject to CEQA (California Environmental Quality Act) review (i.e., non-exempt projects), project applicants shall prepare and submit a technical assessment evaluating potential project operation phase-related air quality impacts to the City of Santa Ana for review and approval. The evaluation shall be prepared in conformance with South Coast Air Quality Management District (South Coast AQMD) methodology in assessing air quality impacts. If operation-related air pollutants are determined to have the potential to exceed the South Coast AQMD's adopted thresholds of significance, the City of Santa Ana shall require that applicants for new development

projects incorporate mitigation measures to reduce air pollutant emissions during operational activities. The identified measures shall be included as part of the conditions of approval. Possible mitigation measures to reduce long-term emissions could include, but are not limited to the following:

- For site-specific development that require refrigerated vehicles, the construction documents shall demonstrate an adequate number of electrical service connections at loading docks for plug-in for the anticipated number of refrigerated trailers to reduce idling time and emissions.

- Applicants for manufacturing and light industrial uses shall consider energy storage and combined heat and power in appropriate applications to optimize renewable energy generation systems and avoid peak energy use.

- Site-specific developments with truck delivery and loading areas and truck parking spaces shall include signage as a reminder to limit idling of vehicles while parked for loading/unloading in accordance with California Air Resources Board Rule 2845 (13 CCR Chapter 10 § 2485).

- Provide changing/shower facilities as specified in Section A5.106.4.3 of the CALGreen Code (Nonresidential Voluntary Measures).

- Provide bicycle parking facilities per Section A4.106.9 (Residential Voluntary Measures) of the CALGreen Code and Sec. 41-1307.1 of the Santa Ana Municipal Code.

- Provide preferential parking spaces for low-emitting, fuel-efficient, and carpool/van vehicles per Section A5.106.5.1 of the CALGreen Code (Nonresidential Voluntary Measures).

- Provide facilities to support electric charging stations per Section A5.106.5.3 (Nonresidential Voluntary Measures) and Section A5.106.8.2 (Residential Voluntary Measures) of the CALGreen Code.

- Applicant-provided appliances (e.g., dishwashers, refrigerators, clothes washers, and dryers) shall be Energy Star–certified appliances or appliances of equivalent energy efficiency. Installation of Energy Star–certified or equivalent appliances shall be verified by Building & Safety during plan check.

- Applicants for future development projects along existing and planned transit routes shall coordinate with the City of Santa Ana and Orange County Transit Authority to ensure that bus pad and shelter improvements are incorporated, as appropriate.

Finding

Finding 3. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the GPU that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Draft PEIR. These

changes are identified in the form of the mitigation measure above. The City of Santa Ana hereby finds that implementation of the mitigation measure is feasible, and the measure is therefore adopted.

However, the City finds that there are no other mitigation measures that are feasible, taking into consideration specific economic, legal, social, technological or other factors, that would mitigate this impact to a less-than-significant level, and further, that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the alternatives identified in the PEIR, as discussed in Section G of these Findings (Public Resources Code §§ 21081(a)(1), (3); Guidelines §§ 15091(a)(1), (3)). As described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the City has determined that this impact is acceptable because specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits, including regionwide or statewide environmental benefits, of the GPU outweigh its significant effects on the environment.

Impact 5.2-2: Construction activities associated with future development that would be accommodated under the General Plan Update could generate short-term emissions in exceedance of the South Coast Air Quality Management District's threshold criteria.

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.2, Air Quality, starting on page 5.2-30 of the Draft PEIR.

Buildout of the GPU would occur over a period of approximately 25 years or longer. Construction activities associated with buildout of the GPU could generate short-term emissions that exceed the South Coast AQMD'S significance thresholds during this time and cumulatively contribute to the nonattainment designations of the SoCAB. Implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ-1 would reduce criteria air pollutant emissions from construction-related activities to the extent feasible. However, construction time frames and equipment for site-specific development projects are not available at this time, and there is a potential for multiple development projects to be constructed at one time, resulting in significant construction-related emissions. Therefore, despite adherence to Mitigation Measure AQ-1, Impact 5.2-2 would remain significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures

AQ-1 Prior to discretionary approval by the City of Santa Ana for development projects subject to CEQA (California Environmental Quality Act) review (i.e., non-exempt projects), project applicants shall prepare and submit a technical assessment evaluating potential project construction-related air quality impacts to the City of Santa Ana for review and approval. The evaluation shall be prepared in conformance with South Coast Air Quality Management District (South Coast AQMD) methodology for assessing air quality impacts. If construction-related criteria air pollutants are determined to have the potential to exceed the South Coast AQMD's adopted thresholds of significance, the City of Santa Ana shall require that applicants for new development projects incorporate mitigation measures to reduce air pollutant

emissions during construction activities. These identified measures shall be incorporated into all appropriate construction documents (e.g., construction management plans) submitted to the City and shall be verified by the City. Mitigation measures to reduce construction-related emissions could include, but are not limited to:

- Require fugitive-dust control measures that exceed South Coast AQMD's Rule 403, such as:
  - Use of nontoxic soil stabilizers to reduce wind erosion.
  - Apply water every four hours to active soil-disturbing activities.
- Use construction equipment rated by the United States Environmental Protection Agency as having Tier 3 (model year 2006 or newer) or Tier 4 (model year 2008 or newer) emission limits, applicable for engines between 50 and 750 horsepower
- Ensure that construction equipment is properly serviced and maintained to the manufacturer's standards.
- Limit nonessential idling of construction equipment to no more than five consecutive minutes.
- Limit on-site vehicle travel speeds on unpaved roads to 15 miles per hour.
- Install wheel washers for all exiting trucks or wash off all trucks and equipment leaving the project area.
- Use Super-Compliant VOC paints for coating of architectural surfaces whenever possible. A list of Super-Compliant architectural coating manufactures can be found on the South Coast AQMD's website.

Finding

Finding 3. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the GPU that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Draft PEIR. These changes are identified in the form of the mitigation measure above. The City of Santa Ana hereby finds that implementation of the mitigation measure is feasible, and the measure is therefore adopted.

The City finds that there are no other mitigation measures that are feasible, taking into consideration specific economic, legal, social, technological or other factors, that would mitigate this impact to a less-than-significant level, and further, that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the alternatives identified in the PEIR, as discussed in Section G of these Findings (Public Resources Code §§ 21081(a)(1), (3); Guidelines §§ 15091(a)(1), (3)). As described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the City has determined that this impact is acceptable because specific overriding economic, legal, social,

technological, or other benefits, including regionwide or statewide environmental benefits, of the GPU outweigh its significant effects on the environment.

Impact 5.2-3: Implementation of the General Plan Update would generate long-term emissions in exceedance of South Coast AQMD's threshold criteria.

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.2, Air Quality, starting on page 5.2-31 of the Draft PEIR.

Buildout in accordance with the GPU would generate long-term emissions that would exceed South Coast AQMD's regional significance thresholds and cumulatively contribute to the nonattainment designations of the SoCAB. Mitigation Measure AQ-2, in addition to the goals and policies of the GPU, would reduce air pollutant emissions to the extent feasible. The measures and policies covering topics such as expansion of the pedestrian and bicycle networks, promotion of public and active transit, and support to increase building energy efficiency and energy conservation would also reduce criteria air pollutants in the city. Further, compared to existing baseline year conditions, emissions of NOx, CO, and SOx are projected to decrease from current levels despite growth associated with the GPU.

However, Impact 5.2-3 would remain significant and unavoidable due to the magnitude of the overall land use development associated with the GPU. Contributing to the nonattainment status would also contribute to elevating health effects associated with these criteria air pollutants. Reducing emissions would further contribute to reducing possible health effects related to criteria air pollutants.

It is speculative for this broad-based GPU to determine how exceeding the regional thresholds would affect the number of days the region is in nonattainment, since mass emissions are not correlated with concentrations of emissions, or how many additional individuals in the air basin would suffer health effects. South Coast AQMD is the primary agency responsible for ensuring the health and welfare of sensitive individuals to elevated concentrations of air quality in the SoCAB, and at the present time it has not provided methodology to assess the specific correlation between mass emissions generated and the effect on health in order to address the issue raised in the Friant Ranch case.

Ozone concentrations are dependent upon a variety of complex factors, including the presence of sunlight and precursor pollutants, natural topography, nearby structures that cause building downwash, atmospheric stability, and wind patterns. Because of the complexities of predicting ground-level ozone concentrations in relation to the National and California Ambient Air Quality Standards, it is not possible to link health risks to the magnitude of emissions exceeding the significance thresholds. To achieve the health-based standards established by the EPA, the air districts prepare air quality management plans that detail regional programs to attain the ambient air quality standards. However, because cumulative development within the city would exceed the regional significance thresholds, the proposed project could contribute to an increase in health effects in the basin until the attainment standards are met in the SoCAB.

Mitigation Measures

Refer to Mitigation Measure AQ-2, above.

Finding

Finding 3. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the GPU that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Draft PEIR. These changes are identified in the form of the mitigation measure above. The City of Santa Ana hereby finds that implementation of the mitigation measure is feasible, and the measure is therefore adopted.

The City finds that there are no other mitigation measures that are feasible, taking into consideration specific economic, legal, social, technological or other factors, that would mitigate this impact to a less-than-significant level, and further, that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the alternatives identified in the PEIR, as discussed in Section G of these Findings (Public Resources Code §§ 21081(a)(1), (3); Guidelines §§ 15091(a)(1), (3)). As described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the City has determined that this impact is acceptable because specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits, including regionwide or statewide environmental benefits, of the GPU outweigh its significant effects on the environment.

Impact 5.2-4: Operation of industrial and warehousing land uses accommodated under the General Plan Update could expose sensitive receptors to substantial toxic air contaminant concentrations.

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.2, Air Quality, starting on page 5.2-34 of the Draft PEIR.

Buildout of the GPU could expose sensitive receptors to substantial concentrations of toxic air contaminants (TAC). Buildout could result in new sources of criteria air pollutant emissions and/or TACs near existing or planned sensitive receptors. Review of development projects by South Coast AQMD for permitted sources of air toxics (e.g., industrial facilities, dry cleaners, and gasoline dispensing facilities) would ensure that health risks are minimized. Additionally, Mitigation Measure AQ-3 would ensure mobile sources of TACs not covered under South Coast AQMD permits are considered during subsequent, project-level environmental review by the City of Santa Ana. Individual development projects would be required to achieve the incremental risk thresholds established by South Coast AQMD, and TACs would be less than significant.

However, implementation of the GPU would generate TACs that could contribute to elevated levels in the air basin. Though individual projects would achieve the project-level risk threshold of 10 per million, they would nonetheless contribute to the higher levels of risk in the SoCAB. Therefore, the GPU's cumulative contribution to health risk is significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures

AQ-3 Prior to discretionary approval by the City of Santa Ana, project applicants for new industrial or warehousing development projects that 1) have the potential to generate 100 or more diesel truck trips per day or have 40 or more trucks with operating diesel-powered transport refrigeration units, and 2) are within 1,000 feet of a sensitive land use (e.g., residential, schools, hospitals, or nursing homes), as measured from the property line of the project to the property line of the nearest sensitive use, shall submit a health risk assessment (HRA) to the City of Santa Ana for review and approval. The HRA shall be prepared in accordance with policies and procedures of the State Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment and the South Coast Air Quality Management District. If the HRA shows that the incremental cancer risk and/or noncancer hazard index exceed the respective thresholds, as established by the South Coast AQMD at the time a project is considered, the project applicant will be required to identify and demonstrate that best available control technologies for toxics (T-BACTs), including appropriate enforcement mechanisms, are capable of reducing potential cancer and noncancer risks to an acceptable level. T-BACTs may include, but are not limited to, restricting idling on-site, electrifying warehousing docks to reduce diesel particulate matter, or requiring use of newer equipment and/or vehicles. T BACTs identified in the HRA shall be identified as mitigation measures in the environmental document and/or incorporated into the site plan.

Finding

Finding 3. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the GPU that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Draft PEIR. These changes are identified in the form of the mitigation measure above. The City of Santa Ana hereby finds that implementation of the mitigation measure is feasible, and the measure is therefore adopted.

The City finds that there are no other mitigation measures that are feasible, taking into consideration specific economic, legal, social, technological or other factors, that would mitigate this impact to a less-than-significant level, and further, that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the alternatives identified in the PEIR, as discussed in Section G of these Findings (Public Resources Code §§ 21081(a)(1), (3); Guidelines §§ 15091(a)(1), (3)). As described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the City has determined that this impact is acceptable because specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits, including regionwide or statewide environmental benefits, of the GPU outweigh its significant effects on the environment.

Impact 5.2-5: Development and operation of land uses accommodated by the General Plan Update could generate emissions that exceed the localized significance thresholds and expose sensitive receptors to substantial concentrations of criteria air pollutants.

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.2, Air Quality, starting on page 5.2-35 of the Draft PEIR.

Because existing sensitive receptors may be close to project-related construction activities and large emitters of on-site operation-related criteria air pollutant emissions, construction and operation emissions generated by individual development projects have the potential to exceed South Coast AQMD's Local Significance Thresholds (LSTs). Mitigation Measures AQ-1 and AQ-2 would reduce the regional construction and operation emissions associated with buildout of the GPU and therefore also result in a reduction of localized construction- and operation-related criteria air pollutant emissions, to the extent feasible. However, even with the implementation of these mitigation measures, Impact 5.2-5 would remain significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measures AQ-1 and AQ-2 would also be applicable in reducing construction- and operation-related LST impacts.

Finding

Finding 3. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the GPU that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Draft PEIR. These changes are identified in the form of the mitigation measures above. The City of Santa Ana hereby finds that implementation of the mitigation measures is feasible, and the measures are therefore adopted.

The City finds that there are no other mitigation measures that are feasible, taking into consideration specific economic, legal, social, technological or other factors, that would mitigate this impact to a less-than-significant level, and further, that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the alternatives identified in the PEIR, as discussed in Section G of these Findings (Public Resources Code §§ 21081(a)(1), (3); Guidelines §§ 15091(a)(1), (3)). As described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the City has determined that this impact is acceptable because specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits, including regionwide or statewide environmental benefits, of the GPU outweigh its significant effects on the environment.

2. Cultural Resources

Impact 5.4-1: Buildout consistent with the General Plan Update could impact an identified historic resource.

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.4, Cultural Resources, starting on page 5.4-26 of the Draft PEIR.

Generally, potential impacts to historical resources resulting from future projects developed pursuant to the GPU would be mitigated by the City's fulfillment of its statutory responsibilities under CEQA. However, for certain development pursuant to the GPU, the City may determine that significant impacts to historical resources cannot be avoided. The City shall require, at a minimum, that the affected historical resources be thoroughly documented before issuance of any permits. Though the possible demolition or alteration of a historical resource cannot be mitigated to a less than significant level, recordation of the resource will reduce significant adverse impacts to historical resources to the maximum extent feasible.

With fulfillment of the CUL-1 and CUL-2, future development consistent with the GPU would result in a less than significant impact to cultural resources. However, if significant impacts cannot be avoided, the City shall require, at a minimum, that the affected historical resources are documented consistent with Mitigation Measure CUL-3. The Historical Resources Technical Report determined that unavoidable impacts to historical resources resulting from future development under the GPU will be reduced to the maximum extent feasible, but will still be significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-3. Therefore, the development under the GPU would result in significant and unavoidable impacts.

Mitigation Measures

CUL-1 **Identification of Historical Resources and Potential Project Impacts.** For structures 45 years or older, a Historical Resources Assessment (HRA) shall be prepared by an architectural historian or historian meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards. The HRA shall include: definition of a study area or area of potential effect, which will encompass the affected property and may include surrounding properties or historic district(s); an intensive level survey of the study area to identify and evaluate under federal, State, and local criteria significance historical resources that might be directly or indirectly affected by the proposed project; and an assessment of project impacts. The HRA shall satisfy federal and State guidelines for the identification, evaluation, and recordation of historical resources. An HRA is not required if an existing historic resources survey and evaluation of the property is available; however, if the existing survey and evaluation is more than five years old, it shall be updated.

CUL-2 **Use of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.** The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties shall be used to the maximum extent practicable to ensure that projects involving the relocation, conversion,

rehabilitation, or alteration of a historical resource and its setting or related new construction will not impair the significance of the historical resource. Use of the Standards shall be overseen by an architectural historian or historic architect meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards. Evidence of compliance with the Standards shall be provided to the City in the form of a report identifying and photographing character-defining features and spaces and specifying how the proposed treatment of character-defining features and spaces and related construction activities will conform to the Standards. The Qualified Professional shall monitor the construction and provide a report to the City at the conclusion of the project. Use of the Secretary's Standards shall reduce the project impacts on historical resources to less than significant.

CUL-3 **Documentation, Education, and Memorialization.** If the City determines that significant impacts to historical resources cannot be avoided, the City shall require, at a minimum, that the affected historical resources be thoroughly documented before issuance of any permits and may also require additional public education efforts and/or memorialization of the historical resource. Though demolition or alteration of a historical resource such that its significance is materially impaired cannot be mitigated to a less than significant level, recordation of the resource will reduce significant adverse impacts to historical resources to the maximum extent feasible. Such recordation should be prepared under the supervision of an architectural historian, historian, or historic architect meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards and should take the form of Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) documentation. At a minimum, this recordation should include an architectural and historical narrative; archival photographic documentation; and supplementary information, such as building plans and elevations and/or historic photographs. The documentation package should be reproduced on archival paper and should be made available to researchers and the public through accession by appropriate institutions such as the Santa Ana Library History Room, the South Central Coastal Information Center at California State University, Fullerton, and/or the HABS collection housed in the Library of Congress. Depending on the significance of the adversely affected historical resource, the City, at its discretion, may also require public education about the historical resource in the form of an exhibit, web page, brochure, or other format and/or memorialization of the historical resource on or near the proposed project site. If memorialized, such memorialization shall be a permanent installation, such as a mural, display, or other vehicle that recalls the location, appearance, and historical significance of the affected historical resource, and shall be designed in conjunction with a qualified architectural historian, historian, or historic architect.

Finding

Finding 3. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the GPU that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Draft PEIR. These

changes are identified in the form of the mitigation measures above. The City of Santa Ana hereby finds that implementation of the mitigation measures is feasible, and the measures are therefore adopted.

The City finds that there are no other mitigation measures that are feasible, taking into consideration specific economic, legal, social, technological or other factors, that would mitigate this impact to a less-than-significant level, and further, that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the alternatives identified in the PEIR, as discussed in Section G of these Findings (Public Resources Code §§ 21081(a)(1), (3); Guidelines §§ 15091(a)(1), (3)). As described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the City has determined that this impact is acceptable because specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits, including regionwide or statewide environmental benefits, of the GPU outweigh its significant effects on the environment.

3. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Impact 5.7-1: Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would result in a decrease in GHG emissions in horizon year 2045 from existing baseline but may not meet the long-term GHG reduction goal under Executive Order S-03-05.

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.7, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, starting on page 5.7-31 of the Draft PEIR.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure GHG-1 would ensure that the City is tracking and monitoring the City's GHG emissions in order to chart a trajectory to achieve the long-term, year 2050, GHG reduction goal set by Executive Order S-03-05. However, at this time, there is no plan past 2030 that achieves the long-term GHG reduction goal established under Executive Order S-03-05. As identified by the California Council on Science and Technology, the state cannot meet the 2050 goal without major advancements in technology. Advancements in technology in the future could provide additional reductions and allow the state and City to meet the 2050 goal, but in the meantime, Impact 5.7-1 would be significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures

GHG-1 The City of Santa Ana shall update the Climate Action Plan (CAP) every five years to ensure the City is monitoring the plan's progress toward achieving the City's greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction target and to require amendment if the plan is not achieving the specified level. The update shall consider a trajectory consistent with the GHG emissions reduction goal established under Executive Order S-03-05 for year 2050 and the latest applicable statewide legislative GHG emission reduction that may be in effect at the time of the CAP update (e.g., Senate Bill 32 for year 2030). The CAP update shall include the following:

- GHG inventories of existing and forecast year GHG levels.
- Tools and strategies for reducing GHG emissions to ensure a trajectory with the long-term GHG reduction goal of Executive Order S-03-05.
- Plan implementation guidance that includes, at minimum, the following components consistent with the proposed CAP:
  - Administration and Staffing
  - Finance and Budgeting
  - Timelines for Measure Implementation
  - Community Outreach and Education
  - Monitoring, Reporting, and Adaptive Management
  - Tracking Tools

Finding

Finding 3. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the GPU that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Draft PEIR. These changes are identified in the form of the mitigation measure above. The City of Santa Ana hereby finds that implementation of the mitigation measure is feasible, and the measure is therefore adopted.

The City finds that there are no other mitigation measures that are feasible, taking into consideration specific economic, legal, social, technological or other factors, that would mitigate this impact to a less-than-significant level, and further, that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the alternatives identified in the PEIR, as discussed in Section G of these Findings (Public Resources Code §§ 21081(a)(1), (3); Guidelines §§ 15091(a)(1), (3)). As described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the City has determined that this impact is acceptable because specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits, including regionwide or statewide environmental benefits, of the GPU outweigh its significant effects on the environment.

4. Noise

Impact 5.12-1: Construction activities associated with buildout of the plan area would result in temporary noise increases at sensitive receptors.

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.12, Noise, starting on page 5.12-29 of the Draft PEIR.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure N-1 would reduce potential noise impacts during construction to the extent feasible. However, due to the potential for proximity of construction activities to sensitive uses, the number of construction projects occurring simultaneously, and the potential duration of construction activities, construction noise could result in a temporary

substantial increase in noise levels above ambient conditions. Therefore, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. It should be noted that the identification of this program-level impact does not preclude the finding of less-than-significant impacts for subsequent projects analyzed at the project level.

Mitigation Measures

N-1 Construction contractors shall implement the following measures for construction activities conducted in the City of Santa Ana. Construction plans submitted to the City shall identify these measures on demolition, grading, and construction plans submitted to the City: The City of Santa Ana Planning and Building Agency shall verify that grading, demolition, and/or construction plans submitted to the City include these notations prior to issuance of demolition, grading, and/or building permits.

- Construction activity is limited to the hours: Between 7 AM to 8 PM Monday through Saturday, as prescribed in Municipal Code Section 18-314(e). Construction is prohibited on Sundays.
- During the entire active construction period, equipment and trucks used for project construction shall use the best-available noise control techniques (e.g., improved mufflers, equipment re-design, use of intake silencers, ducts, engine enclosures, and acoustically attenuating shields or shrouds), wherever feasible.
- Impact tools (e.g., jack hammers and hoe rams) shall be hydraulically or electrically powered wherever possible. Where the use of pneumatic tools is unavoidable, an exhaust muffler on the compressed air exhaust shall be used along with external noise jackets on the tools.
- Stationary equipment, such as generators and air compressors shall be located as far as feasible from nearby noise-sensitive uses.
- Stockpiling shall be located as far as feasible from nearby noise-sensitive receptors.
- Construction traffic shall be limited, to the extent feasible, to approved haul routes established by the City Planning and Building Agency.
- At least 10 days prior to the start of construction activities, a sign shall be posted at the entrance(s) to the job site, clearly visible to the public, that includes permitted construction days and hours, as well as the telephone numbers of the City's and contractor's authorized representatives that are assigned to respond in the event of a noise or vibration complaint. If the authorized contractor's representative receives a complaint, he/she shall investigate, take appropriate corrective action, and report the action to the City.
- Signs shall be posted at the job site entrance(s), within the on-site construction zones, and along queueing lanes (if any) to reinforce the prohibition of

unnecessary engine idling. All other equipment shall be turned off if not in use for more than 5 minutes.

- During the entire active construction period and to the extent feasible, the use of noise-producing signals, including horns, whistles, alarms, and bells, shall be for safety warning purposes only. The construction manager shall use smart back-up alarms, which automatically adjust the alarm level based on the background noise level or switch off back-up alarms and replace with human spotters in compliance with all safety requirements and laws.

- Erect temporary noise barriers (at least as high as the exhaust of equipment and breaking line-of-sight between noise sources and sensitive receptors), as necessary and feasible, to maintain construction noise levels at or below the performance standard of 80 dBA Leq. Barriers shall be constructed with a solid material that has a density of at least 4 pounds per square foot with no gaps from the ground to the top of the barrier.

Finding

Finding 3. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the GPU that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Draft PEIR. These changes are identified in the form of the mitigation measure above. The City of Santa Ana hereby finds that implementation of the mitigation measure is feasible, and the measure is therefore adopted.

The City finds that there are no other mitigation measures that are feasible, taking into consideration specific economic, legal, social, technological or other factors, that would mitigate this impact to a less-than-significant level, and further, that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the alternatives identified in the PEIR, as discussed in Section G of these Findings (Public Resources Code §§ 21081(a)(1), (3); Guidelines §§ 15091(a)(1), (3)). As described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the City has determined that this impact is acceptable because specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits, including regionwide or statewide environmental benefits, of the GPU outweigh its significant effects on the environment.

Impact 5.12-2: Buildout of the plan area would cause a substantial traffic noise increase on local roadways and could locate sensitive receptors in areas that exceed established noise standards.

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.12, Noise, starting on page 5.12-30 of the Draft PEIR.

Mitigation Measure N-2 would reduce potential interior noise impacts to future noise-sensitive receptors below the thresholds. However, there are no feasible or practical mitigation measures available to reduce project-generated traffic noise to less than significant levels for existing

residences along affected roadways. No individual measures and no set of feasible or practical mitigation measures are available to reduce project-generated traffic noise to less than significant levels in all cases. Thus, traffic noise would remain a significant and unavoidable impact. It should be noted that the identification of this program-level impact does not preclude the finding of less-than-significant impacts for subsequent projects analyzed at the project level.

Mitigation Measures

Refer to Mitigation Measure N-2, above.

Finding

Finding 3. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the GPU that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Draft PEIR. These changes are identified in the form of the mitigation measure above. The City of Santa Ana hereby finds that implementation of the mitigation measure is feasible, and the measure is therefore adopted."

The City finds that there are no mitigation measures that are feasible, taking into consideration specific economic, legal, social, technological or other factors, that would mitigate this impact to a less-than-significant level, and further, that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the alternatives identified in the PEIR, as discussed in Section G of these Findings (Public Resources Code §§ 21081(a)(1), (3); Guidelines §§ 15091(a)(1), (3)). As described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the City has determined that this impact is acceptable because specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits, including regionwide or statewide environmental benefits, of the GPU outweigh its significant effects on the environment.

5. Population and Housing

Impact 5.13-1: The GPU would directly induce substantial unplanned population growth.

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.13, Population and Housing, starting on page 5.13-12 of the Draft PEIR.

Full buildout of the GPU would result in a population of 431,629, and the city's 2045 population growth would be approximately 20 percent greater than the Orange County Council of Governments' 2045 projections. Furthermore, the city's housing units at buildout would be 115,053, which exceeds the Orange County Council of Governments' projection by 38 percent. There are no feasible mitigation measures to mitigate the population and housing growth at buildout, and impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures

There are no feasible mitigation measures to mitigate the population and housing growth at buildout.

Finding

Finding 3. The City finds that there are no mitigation measures that are feasible, taking into consideration specific economic, legal, social, technological or other factors, that would mitigate this impact to a less-than-significant level, and further, that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the alternatives identified in the PEIR, as discussed in Section G of these Findings (Public Resources Code §§ 21081(a)(1), (3); Guidelines §§ 15091(a)(1), (3)). As described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the City has determined that this impact is acceptable because specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits, including regionwide or statewide environmental benefits, of the GPU outweigh its significant effects on the environment.

VI. FINDINGS REGARDING ALTERNATIVES

CEQA requires that an EIR include a discussion of reasonable project alternatives that would "feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project, but would avoid or substantially lessen any significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives" (CEQA Guidelines § 15126.6[a]).

As discussed above, the Draft PEIR identified significant impacts in a number of categories. The following impacts could be mitigated below a level of significance: air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, noise, tribal cultural resources impacts. The following impacts cannot be mitigated below a level of significance: certain air quality, cultural resources, greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, noise, and population and housing impacts.

The Draft PEIR analyzed four alternatives to the proposed project that could reduce some, if not all, of the impacts.

A. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED AND REJECTED DURING THE SCOPING/PROJECT PLANNING

"Among the factors that may be used to eliminate alternatives from detailed consideration in an EIR are: (i) failure to meet most of the basic project objectives, (ii) infeasibility, or (iii) inability to avoid significant environmental impacts" (CEQA Guidelines § 15126.6[c]).

Alternative Circulation Element – Roadway Classifications. The proposed circulation element in the GPU evolved over a long process and coordination with the Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA). During this process, alternative packages of arterial roadway classifications were considered that involved roadways in OCTA's Master Plan of Arterial Highways (MPAH). The majority of reclassifications proposed were identified for bicycle facility safety improvements in the City's Safe Mobility Santa Ana (SMSA) Plan, prepared in 2016. Most of the reclassifications identified were for roadways where bicycle and pedestrian safety improvements would require roadway reconfiguration and a reduction in the number of existing or planned travel lanes. Many of the SMSA recommendations across the city have already been, or are in the process of being, implemented along arterial roadways without reducing the number of lanes.

A cursory review of two optional roadway reclassification packages was conducted to determine whether these optional plans would have the potential to eliminate significant impacts of the proposed GPU and meet most the project objectives. It was determined that a detailed evaluation of this alternative was not needed to provide a reasonable range of EIR project alternatives. Transportation/traffic impacts of the proposed project were determined to be less than significant (VMT/SP falls below the significance threshold for the GPU without mitigation). Although these alternatives may have some potential to reduce VMT (by reducing the number of travel lanes for some roadways) and thereby also potentially reduce air quality, greenhouse gas, and traffic noise impacts, these alternatives would also result in more inconsistencies with the MPAH and result in more traffic congestion. Although traffic congestion is no longer a CEQA consideration, the GPU sets forth standards for level of service that will be considered by decision-makers. Moreover, the

Reduced Density and RTP/SCS Consistency alternatives were determined to be meaningful alternatives to consider for the potential of reducing air quality, GHG, and traffic noise impacts.

Reduced Traffic Noise Alternative. Since traffic noise was determined to be a significant, unavoidable impact of the proposed GPU, a project alternative designed to eliminate this significant impact was considered. The required reductions in traffic volumes (ADT) were determined along roadways where buildout of the GPU would result in significant noise increases. These estimates were compared to the surrounding land uses that would generate ADTs for those roadway segments. Traffic noise along these roadways would both exceed the noise standard and abut sensitive land uses (e.g., residences, schools, hospitals). Several segments would experience significant, unavoidable traffic noise impacts without the land use changes proposed under the GPU. Since significant traffic noise could not be avoided, further evaluation of this alternative was not deemed to be meaningful.

B. ALTERNATIVES SELECTED FOR FURTHER ANALYSIS

Given the significant, unavoidable impacts identified for the proposed GPU, project alternatives with the potential to substantially reduce development were identified for further review. Significant GPU impacts to long-term air quality, GHG emissions, and population and housing all directly relate to the level of development that would occur within the city. At the programmatic level of this GPU PEIR, site-specific information regarding potential significant historical impacts is not available, and therefore, an alternative could not be customized to reduce that impact. A reduced intensity alternative would also be expected to reduce the significant traffic noise impact (as discussed above). The following development alternatives to the proposed GPU were chosen for further analysis.

No Project / Current General Plan Alternative

The evaluation of the No Project alternative is required by CEQA. The No Project alternative is typically defined as the development scenario that would occur if the project as proposed is not adopted. For a General Plan, the No Project alternative is typically represented by the jurisdiction's existing General Plan, including land use plan, circulation master plan, and policies in each General Plan element. Therefore, this alternative assumes that the existing General Plan—with various adoption dates for different elements between 1982 and 2014—would remain in effect. This existing General Plan also reflects amendments, including new Specific Plans and special zoning areas that have been adopted through the Notice of Preparation for this GPU.

Finding. The City Council rejects the No Project/Current General Plan Alternative on the basis of policy and economic factors as explained herein. (See Pub. Resources Code, § 21061.1; CEQA Guidelines, § 15364; see also *City of Del Mar v. City of San Diego* (1982) 133 Cal.App.3d 410, 417; *California Native Plant Soc. v. City of Santa Cruz* (2009) 177 Cal.App.4th 957, 1001; *Sequoyah Hills Homeowners Assn. v. City of Oakland* (1993) 23 Cal.App.4th 704, 715.) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible this project alternative identified in the Final PEIR.

This alternative would result in similar impacts to 11 impact categories, reduced impacts to 5 environmental impacts, and increase impacts to 4 categories. Impacts would be similar for agricultural resources, biological resources, cultural resources, energy, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, mineral resources, noise, tribal cultural resources, and wildfire. This alternative would reduce impacts for aesthetics, population and housing, public services, recreation, and utilities and service systems. Impacts to air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, land use and planning, and transportation would increase. This alternative does not mitigate any of the significant and unavoidable impacts associated with the GPU to a less than significant impact. It would also exceed the City's VMT threshold. Overall, impacts under this alternative would decrease in comparison to the proposed project.

The No Project/Current General Plan alternative would not achieve many of the proposed project objectives. The existing land use plan does not provide the opportunities to provide housing and employment at the levels required to meet local and regional goals. Moreover, the No Project alternative would not provide numerous general policies as included in the GPU to achieve these goals and invigorate communities. The current General Plan, however, protects established neighborhoods and several Specific Plans and Special Zoning areas would provide for infill opportunities, protect established neighborhoods, and result in mixed-use villages and bike- and pedestrian-friendly communities.

Reduced Intensity Alternative

(Reduced capacity for the 55 Freeway/Dyer and South Bristol focus areas) Under the GPU, the only areas that include revisions to land use designations to accommodate new growth are within the five focus areas. The majority of remaining growth would occur within previously approved Specific Plans and Special Zoning areas. A nominal amount of growth is assumed to occur in other areas of the city and would not require land use amendments. The Reduced Intensity Alternative would substantially reduce development capacity within two focus areas, 55 Freeway/Dyer and South Bristol Street, which accommodate approximately 65 percent of the housing unit growth and 72 percent of the nonresidential use (by building square footage) of the growth projected for the combined focus areas under the GPU. For the focus areas, the forecast buildout is based on development at approximately 80 percent of the maximum allowed development for each respective land use designation. For this alternative, development of the 55 Freeway/Dyer and South Bristol focus areas would be reduced to approximately 50 percent of the maximum allowed per the land use designations. This alternative would reduce housing units by a total of 5,383 and would reduce total building square footage by approximately 4.2 million square feet distributed between these two focus areas. This alternative would also reduce population by 19,825 and jobs by 9,184. Overall, this alternative would reduce the housing growth accommodated by the GPU land use changes by approximately 18 percent and reduce nonresidential building square footage by approximately 27 percent.

Finding. The City Council rejects the Reduced Intensity Alternative on the basis of policy and economic factors as explained herein. (See Pub. Resources Code, § 21061.1; CEQA Guidelines, § 15364; see also *City of Del Mar v. City of San Diego* (1982) 133 Cal.App.3d 410, 417; *California*

Native Plant Soc. v. City of Santa Cruz (2009) 177 Cal.App.4th 957, 1001; *Sequoyah Hills Homeowners Assn. v. City of Oakland* (1993) 23 Cal.App.4th 704, 715.) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible this project alternative identified in the Final PEIR.

This alternative would result in similar impacts to 7 impact categories, reduce impacts to 12 categories, and increase impacts to 1 category. Impacts would be similar for aesthetics, agricultural resources, biological resources, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, mineral resources, and wildfire. This alternative would decrease impacts to air quality, cultural resources, energy, geology and soils, greenhouse gas emissions, noise, population and housing, public services, recreation, tribal cultural resources, transportation, and utilities and services. It would be expected to increase land use and planning impacts relative to the GPU. As with the GPU, impacts to air quality, cultural resources, greenhouse gas emissions, noise, and population and housing would remain significant and unavoidable. Overall, impacts under this alternative would be decreased in comparison to the proposed project.

The Reduced Density Alternative reduces the level of development for two of the five focus areas (55 Freeway/Dyer Road and South Bristol Street) relative to the GPU. No other changes to the GPU are made for this alternative. It is assumed to include the same General Plan policies and would not modify the circulation element or related improvements. Therefore, this alternative would attain many of the project's objectives. It would not "optimize" high density housing and mass transit opportunities, and so was found not to attain objective No. 2. It would, however, achieve objectives Nos. 3 through 5, but to a lesser extent than the proposed GPU. With the reduced opportunities in the 55 Freeway/Dyer Road and South Bristol focus areas, it would not be as effective in providing affordable housing opportunities, and may not be as economically feasible in terms of funding community benefits. It would provide mixed-use opportunities that are bike and pedestrian friendly and provide opportunities for live-work, artist spaces, and small-scale manufacturing.

2020 RTP/SCS Consistency Alternative

(Reduced development for RTP/SCS population/housing consistency) This alternative was developed to evaluate an update to the General Plan that would be consistent with the population and housing projections used to develop the Southern California Association of Governments' (SCAG) most recent Regional Transportation Plan / Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS)—Connect SoCal (adopted May 7, 2020). Connect SoCal is a long-range visioning plan that balances future mobility and housing needs with economic, environmental, and public health goals. The plan embodies a collective vision for the region's future and is developed with input from local governments, county transportation commissions, tribal governments, nonprofit organizations, businesses, and local stakeholders in the counties of Imperial, Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, and Ventura. The proposed GPU would result in a significant population and housing impact because development under the GPU would substantially exceed the projections used in Connect SoCal. SCAG uses locally prepared population and housing projections to develop the regional plan. For the City of Santa Ana, those projections were

provided by the Orange County Council of Governments, as prepared by the Center for Demographic Research. The population/housing figures reflected for Santa Ana in the regional plan for 2045 are: population, 360,100; total housing units, 80,100; and total jobs, 176,400. Projections for the RTP/SCS (Connect SoCal) use land use designations as approved in adopted general plans. The employment projections are similar for the GPU and RTP/SCS scenarios, but the RTP/SCS projections for population and housing units are substantially lower than GPU projections (18 percent and 27 percent lower, respectively). The RTP/SCS alternative, therefore, represents the least-development-intensive project alternative evaluated for the Draft PEIR.

§ This alternative would substantially reduce the growth that would be accommodated within the focus areas under the GPU. New growth within the focus areas would total 6,380 housing units and approximately 3.7 million square feet of nonresidential uses, instead of a total additional 23,955 housing units and approximately 15.7 million square feet within the focus areas. This alternative distributes anticipated development through the focus areas and the approved Specific Plans/Special Zoning areas. For purposes of this alternative, it is assumed that a development cap would be used to limit total growth to the projections shown.

§ Subsequent updates of the regional plan would incorporate updated land use from the GPU and resolve the substantial discrepancy between the population and housing projections. Note also that the Draft PEIR concludes that the GPU is consistent with the goals of the RTP/SCS. This alternative has been defined to eliminate the significant impact associated with substantial population growth that is inconsistent with the regional plan, as well as reduce other significant growth-related (AQ/GHG, traffic noise) impacts associated with the GPU as proposed.

Finding. The City Council rejects the 2020 RTP/SCS Consistency Alternative on the basis of policy and economic factors as explained herein. (See Pub. Resources Code, § 21061.1; CEQA Guidelines, § 15364; see also *City of Del Mar v. City of San Diego* (1982) 133 Cal.App.3d 410, 417; *California Native Plant Soc. v. City of Santa Cruz* (2009) 177 Cal.App.4th 957, 1001; *Sequoyah Hills Homeowners Assn. v. City of Oakland* (1993) 23 Cal.App.4th 704, 715.) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible this project alternative identified in the Final PEIR.

This alternative would reduce impacts to 12 environmental impacts, result in similar impacts to 6 categories, and increase impacts to 1 category. It would reduce impacts to air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, energy, geology and soils, greenhouse gas emissions, noise, population and housing, public services, recreation, tribal cultural resources, and utilities and service systems. Impacts would be very similar for aesthetics, agricultural resources, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, mineral resources, and wildfire. It would increase impacts to land use and planning. It would also increase impacts to transportation and potentially introduce a new significant impact. It is anticipated, however, that under this alternative, transportation could be mitigated to less than significant. Under the GPU, transportation impacts are less than significant without mitigation. As with the GPU, impacts to air quality, cultural

resources, greenhouse gas emissions, and noise would remain significant and unavoidable. The impact to population and housing would be reduced to less than significant. Overall, impacts under this alternative would be reduced in comparison to the proposed project.

Due to the substantial reduction in housing opportunities citywide, this alternative is the least effective in achieving the project objectives of the GPU. By setting a development cap to limit housing and nonresidential development to the projections for the city in the 2020 RTP/SCS, this alternative reduces housing units by 31,515 compared to the GPU. It reduces housing development potential within the focus areas by 73 percent in comparison to the GPU, and reduces overall city future development by 27 percent. To achieve this reduction, the development cap would not only limit focus area development but would restrict the entitled housing in Specific Plans/Special Zoning areas (reducing total housing within these areas by almost 14,000 units). This alternative clearly would not optimize high density housing that maximizes mass transit use (objective No. 2) or provide urban-level intensities at the urban edges (objective No. 3). Moreover, it would not facilitate intensities that attract economic activities, particularly since it would not allow the maximum entitlement of approved Specific Plans and Special Zoning areas. It would achieve the remainder of the objectives, but to a lesser extent than the GPU. It would protect established neighborhoods, but not promote infill development as much as the GPU or other alternatives (objective No. 1). It would provide only limited opportunities for live-work and artist spaces and small-scale manufacturing (objective No. 7).

C. ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

CEQA requires a lead agency to identify the “environmentally superior alternative” and, in cases where the “No Project” Alternative is environmentally superior to the GPU, the environmentally superior development alternative must be identified. One alternative has been identified as “environmentally superior” to the GPU:

§ The RTP/SCS Consistency Alternative is concluded to be the environmentally superior alternative. The No Project alternative is not environmentally superior to the proposed GPU. Both the Reduced Density and RTP/SCS alternatives reduce environmental impacts in comparison to the GPU, but the RTP/SCS reduces more impacts and eliminates a significant, unavoidable impact of the GPU. This alternative was designed to eliminate the significant population impact of the GPU, but it also reduces potential future development more than any of the other alternatives.

VII. STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

A. INTRODUCTION

The City of Santa Ana is the Lead Agency under CEQA for preparation, review and certification of the PEIR for General Plan Update PEIR (project). As the Lead Agency, the City is also responsible for determining the potential environmental impacts of the proposed action and which of those impacts are significant, and which can be mitigated through imposition of mitigation measures to avoid or minimize those impacts to a level of less than significant. CEQA then requires the Lead Agency to balance the benefits of a proposed action against its significant unavoidable adverse environmental impacts in determining whether or not to approve the proposed project. In making this determination the City is guided by CEQA Guidelines Section 15093, Statement of Overriding Considerations, which states:

a. CEQA requires the decision-making agency to balance, as applicable, the economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of a proposed project against its unavoidable environmental risks when determining whether to approve the project. If the specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of a proposed project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, the adverse environmental effects may be considered "acceptable."

b. When the lead agency approves a project which will result in the occurrence of significant effects which are identified in the final EIR but are not avoided or substantially lessened, the agency shall state in writing the specific reasons to support its action based on the final EIR and/or other information in the record. The statement of overriding considerations shall be supported by substantial evidence in the record.

c. If an agency makes a statement of overriding considerations, the statement should be included in the record of the project approval and should be mentioned in the notice of determination. This statement does not substitute for, and shall be in addition to, findings required pursuant to Section 15091.

In addition, Public Resources Code Section 21081(b) requires that where a public agency finds that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or alternatives identified in an EIR and thereby leave significant unavoidable effects, the public agency must also find that overriding economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of the project outweigh the significant effects of the project.

Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081(b) and the State CEQA Guidelines Section 15093, the City has balanced the benefits of the proposed project against the unavoidable adverse impacts associated with the project and has adopted all feasible mitigation measures

with respect to these impacts. The City also has examined alternatives to the proposed project, none of which both meets the project objectives and is environmentally preferable to the proposed project, for the reasons discussed in the Findings and Facts in Support of Findings.

The City of Santa Ana, as the Lead Agency for this project, and having reviewed the PEIR for the GPU, and reviewed all written materials within the City's public record and heard all oral testimony presented at public hearings, adopts this Statement of Overriding Considerations, which has balanced the benefits of the project against its significant unavoidable adverse environmental impacts in reaching its decision to approve the project.

B. OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

The City, after balancing the specific economic, legal, social, technological, and other benefits of the project, has determined that the unavoidable adverse environmental impacts identified above may be considered acceptable due to the following specific considerations, which outweigh the unavoidable, adverse environmental impacts of the project, and each of which, standing alone, is sufficient to support approval of the project, in accordance with CEQA Section 21081(b) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15093. The specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of the project are as follows:

1. The community, land use, and public services elements of the project encourage healthy lifestyles, a planning process that ensures that health impacts are considered, and policies and practices that improve the health of residents. The policies also affirm and support a socially and economically diverse community with equitable distribution of resources.

2. Implementation of the GPU fulfills one of the key strategies identified in the Santa Ana Strategic Plan in the completion of a comprehensive update of the existing General Plan.

3. The project improves the jobs-housing balance; the ratio of 1.5 would give the city a more equal distribution of employment and housing. The population growth resulting directly from the proposed GPU would be offset by the level of employment opportunity provided to the city's residents and workers commuting into Santa Ana.

4. The project results in a reduction of vehicle miles traveled per service population (VMT/SP) and a reduction in related traffic congestion, air quality, and greenhouse gas emissions compared with existing conditions because the GPU includes policies that promote the reduction of VMT. Policy 2.5 of the land use element encourages infill mixed-use development at all ranges of affordability to reduce VMT, and policy 4.5 aims to concentrate development along high-quality transit corridors. Policy 4.6 of the circulation element promotes reductions in automobile trips and VMT by encouraging transit use and nonmotorized transportation as alternatives to augmenting roadway capacity.

5. The project provides additional housing to support the regionally forecasted increase in economic activities and employment increases.

6. Implementation of the project would introduce policies and actions that address the importance of protecting the health of residents and the environment by improving air quality, reducing greenhouse gas emissions, and encouraging active transportation.

7. The project implements the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS) land use policies related to population and housing by providing additional housing near employment centers.

8. The project facilitates the economic development of the city by promoting development that is mixed use, pedestrian friendly, transit oriented, and clustered around activity centers through new and infill residential development. Additionally, the proposed project would improve the city's jobs/housing balance by supporting development that provides housing and employment opportunities to enable people to live and work in Santa Ana.

9. Implementation of the project would coordinate air quality planning efforts to meet state and federal ambient air quality standards by considering the goals of the Climate Action Plan in all major decision on land use and public infrastructure investment and investing in low- to zero-emission vehicles. These policies also promote development that meets or exceeds standards for energy-efficient building design, and the consideration of sensitive of potential emission sources on sensitive uses.

10. The project promotes economic growth and diversity within the city. The economic prosperity element of the GPU includes policies related to improving Santa Ana's economy and its role within the region.

VIII. RESOLUTION REGARDING CERTIFICATION OF THE PEIR

The City of Santa Ana finds that it has reviewed and considered the Final PEIR in evaluating the proposed project, that the Final PEIR is an accurate and objective statement that fully complies with CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines, and that the Final PEIR reflects the independent judgment of the City.

The City of Santa Ana declares that no new significant information, as defined by State CEQA Guidelines, section 15088.5, has been received by the City after circulation of the Draft PEIR that would require recirculation.

The City of Santa Ana certifies the PEIR based on the entirety of the record of proceedings, including but not limited to the following findings and conclusions:

Findings: The following significant environmental impacts have been identified in the PEIR and will require mitigation as set forth in Section V of this Resolution but cannot be mitigated to a level of insignificance: air quality (project-related and cumulative), cultural resources (project-related), greenhouse gas emissions (project-related), noise (project-related), and population and housing (project-related).

Conclusions

1. Except the impacts (stated above) relating to air quality, cultural resources, greenhouse gas, noise, and population and housing, all significant environmental impacts from the implementation of the proposed project have been identified in the PEIR and, with implementation of the mitigation measures identified, will be mitigated to a level of insignificance.

2. Other alternatives to the proposed project, which could potentially achieve the basic objectives of the proposed project, have been considered and rejected in favor of the proposed project.

3. Environmental, economic, social, and other considerations and benefits derived from the development of the proposed project override and make infeasible any alternatives to the proposed project or further mitigation measures beyond those incorporated into the proposed project.

IX. RESOLUTION ADOPTING A MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PLAN

Pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081.6, the City of Santa Ana hereby adopts the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan attached to this Resolution as Exhibit A. In the event of any inconsistencies between the mitigation measures as set forth herein and the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan, the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan shall control.

X. RESOLUTION REGARDING CONTENTS AND CUSTODIAN OF RECORDS

The documents and materials that constitute the record of proceedings on which these findings have been based are located at the City of Santa Ana Planning Division Counter. The custodian for these records is the City of Santa Ana. This information is provided in compliance with Public Resources Code section 21081.6.

The record of proceedings for the City's decision on the project consists of the following documents, at a minimum:

1. The NOP and all other public notices issued by the City in conjunction with the project.
2. All comments submitted by agencies or members of the public during the 45-day comment periods on the Draft PEIR and the 20-day extension to the comment period.
3. The Final PEIR for the Santa Ana General Plan Update, including comments received on the Draft PEIR, responses to those comments, and technical appendices.
4. The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan for the project.
5. All findings, resolutions, and ordinances adopted by the City in connection with the General Plan Update, and all documents cited or referred to therein.
6. All reports, studies, memoranda, maps, staff reports, or other planning documents relating to the project prepared by the City, consultants to the City, or responsible or trustee agencies with respect to the City's compliance with the requirements of CEQA and with respect to the City's action on the Santa Ana General Plan Update.
7. All documents submitted to the City by other public agencies or members of the public in connection with the General Plan Update PEIR up through project approval. Matters of common knowledge to the City, including, but not limited to federal, state, and local laws and regulations.
8. Any documents expressly cited or referenced in these findings, in addition to those cited above.
9. Any other materials required for the record of proceedings by Public Resources Code section 21167.6, subdivision (e).

The following location is where the record may be reviewed:

City of Santa Ana, Planning Division Counter

20 Civic Center Plaza, M-20

Santa Ana, CA 92701

October 2020 | **Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program**

Santa Ana General Plan Update

City of Santa Ana

Prepared for:

City of Santa Ana
Contact: Verny Carvajal, Principal Planner
20 Civic Center Plaza
Santa Ana, CA 92702
vcarvajal@santa-ana.org

Prepared by:

PlaceWorks
Contact: JoAnn Hadfield, Principal
3 MacArthur Place, Suite 1100
Santa Ana, California 92707
714.966.9220
info@placeworks.com
www.placeworks.com

EXHIBIT C

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

List of Tables

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

This page intentionally left blank.

1. Introduction

1.1 PURPOSE OF MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

This Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) has been developed to provide a vehicle to monitor mitigation measures and conditions of approval outlined in the Final Program Environmental Impact Report. The MMRP has been prepared in conformance with Section 21081.6 of the Public Resources Code and City of Santa Ana monitoring requirements. Section 21081.6 states:

> (a) When making the findings required by paragraph (1) of subdivision subsection (a) of Section 21081 or when adopting a mitigated negative declaration pursuant to paragraph (2) of subdivision (c) of Section 21080, the following requirements shall apply:
>
> > (1) The public agency shall adopt a reporting or monitoring program for the changes made to the project or conditions of project approval, adopted in order to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment. The reporting or monitoring program shall be designed to ensure compliance during project implementation. For those changes which have been required or incorporated into the project at the request of a responsible agency or a public agency having jurisdiction by law over natural resources affected by the project, that agency shall, if so requested by the lead agency or a responsible agency, prepare and submit a proposed reporting or monitoring program.
> >
> > (2) The lead agency shall specify the location and custodian of the documents or other material which constitute the record of proceedings upon which its decision is based.
>
> (b) A public agency shall provide that measures to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment are fully enforceable through permit conditions, agreements, or other measures. Conditions of project approval may be set forth in referenced documents which address required mitigation measures or, in the case of the adoption of a plan, policy, regulation, or other public project, by incorporating the mitigation measures into the plan, policy, regulation, or project design.
>
> (c) Prior to the close of the public review period for a draft environmental impact report or mitigated negative declaration, a responsible agency, or a public agency having jurisdiction over natural resources affected by the project, shall either submit to the lead agency complete and detailed performance objectives for mitigation measures which would address the significant effects on the environment identified by the responsible agency or agency having jurisdiction over natural resources affected by the project, or refer the lead agency to appropriate, readily available guidelines or reference documents. Any mitigation measures submitted to a lead

> agency by a responsible agency or an agency having jurisdiction over natural resources affected by the project shall be limited to measures which mitigate impacts to resources which are subject to the statutory authority of, and definitions applicable to, that agency. Compliance or noncompliance by a responsible agency or agency having jurisdiction over natural resources affected by a project with that requirement shall not limit the authority of the responsible agency or agency having jurisdiction over natural resources affected by a project, or the authority of the lead agency, to approve, condition, or deny projects as provided by this division or any other provision of law.

The MMRP will serve to document compliance with adopted/certified mitigation measures that are formulated to minimize impacts associated with future development that would be accommodated by the Santa Ana General Plan.

1.2 PROJECT SUMMARY

The GPU is the comprehensive update of the Santa Ana General Plan. The purpose of the General Plan Update is to comprehensively update the 1982 plan to reflect current conditions, establish a shared vision of the community's aspirations, and create the policy direction to guide Santa Ana's long-term planning and growth over the next two decades. The General Plan Update will include the City's future development goals and will provide policy statements to achieve those goals. Implementation actions related to each goal or policy will be included as a separate Implementation Plan to ensure successful monitoring of progress as a community.

Furthermore, the GPU will focus on five areas in Santa Ana that are better suited for future development or overall improvement. These focus areas are:

- South Main Street
- Grand Avenue/17th Street
- West Santa Ana Boulevard
- 55 Freeway/Dyer Road
- South Bristol Street

General Plan Update

The updated General Plan is organized into three sections: Services and Infrastructure (I), Natural Environment (II), and Built Environment (III). The proposed GPU addresses the seven topics required by state law as well as five optional topics. State law gives jurisdictions the discretion to incorporate optional topics and to address any of these topics in a single element or across multiple elements. The 12 proposed elements of the GPU will replace 16 existing elements. The GPU will incorporate the current 2014–2021 Housing Element, and no substantive changes are anticipated. The topic of housing will be addressed as a separate effort in late 2021 in accordance with State law. The topic of environmental justice will be incorporated throughout the GPU, with goals and policies incorporated into multiple elements. The 12 elements of the proposed GPU are:

Mandatory Topics

- § Land Use Element
- § Circulation Element
- § Housing Element
- § Open Space Element
- § Conservation Element
- § Safety Element
- § Noise Element

Optional Topics

- § Public Services Element
- § Urban Design Element
- § Community Element
- § Economic Prosperity Element
- § Historic Preservation Element

The GPU will guide growth and development (e.g., infill development, redevelopment, and revitalization/restoration) in the plan area by designating land uses in the proposed land use map and through implementation of updated goals and policies of the GPU. Table 1-1 outlines the proposed land use designations under the GPU.

Table 1-1 Proposed Land Use Designations and Statistics

Land Use Designation	Acres	% of Total
Grand Avenue/17th Street	171.5	—
District Center	23.7	13.8
General Commercial	19.9	11.6
Industrial/Flex	7.1	4.1
Open Space	1.1	0.6
Urban Neighborhood	119.7	69.8
55 Freeway/Dyer Road	354.5	—
District Center	158.0	44.6
General Commercial	68.0	19.2
Industrial/Flex	127.4	35.9
Open Space	1.1	0.3
South Bristol Street	199.9	—
District Center	108.3	54.2
Open Space	6.0	3.0
Urban Neighborhood	85.7	42.9
South Main Street	312.2	—
Industrial/Flex	29.0	9.3
Institutional	19.2	66.1
Low Density Residential	162.3	845.8

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

Table 1-1 Proposed Land Use Designations and Statistics

Land Use Designation	Acres	% of Total
Urban Neighborhood	101.7	62.7
West Santa Ana Boulevard	481.6	—
Corridor Residential	10.0	2.1
General Commercial	21.5	4.5
Industrial/Flex	87.9	18.3
Institutional	45.5	9.4
Low Density Residential	108.1	22.4
Low-Medium Density Residential	6.8	1.4
Medium Density Residential	27.0	5.6
Open Space	133.6	27.7
Professional and Administrative Office	6.2	1.3
Urban Neighborhood	35.0	7.3
Balance of City	11,598.8	—
District Center	124.2	1.1
General Commercial	424.2	3.7
Industrial	2,159.6	18.6
Institutional	886.7	7.6
Low Density Residential	6,173.3	53.2
Low-Medium Density Residential	429.0	3.7
Medium Density Residential	335.3	2.9
One Broadway Plaza District Center	4.1	0.0
Open Space	793.8	6.8
Professional and Administrative Office	260.4	2.2
Urban Neighborhood	4.1	0.0
Not Specified	4.1	0.0
Total	13,118.5	100%

Source: Figures aggregated and projected by PlaceWorks, 2020.

The full buildout scenario is analyzed in comparison to existing conditions. Table 1-2 details buildout statistics. Similarly, the PEIR provides conclusions regarding impact significance for this scenario for both the proposed GPU and project alternatives.

Table 1-2 Buildout Statistical Summary

PLANNING AREA	BUILDOUT		
	Housing Units	Bldg. Sq. Ft.[1]	Jobs
FOCUS AREAS	23,955	15,684,285	35,044
55 Freeway/Dyer Road	9,952	6,142,283	13,302
Grand Avenue/17th Street	2,283	703,894	1,622
South Bristol Street	5,492	5,082,641	11,192
South Main Street	2,308	946,662	2,151
West Santa Ana Boulevard	3,920	2,808,805	6,777
SPECIFIC PLAN / SPECIAL ZONING	20,524	16,958,445	39,702
Adaptive Reuse Overlay Zone[2]	1,260	976,935	2,567
Bristol Street Corridor Specific Plan	135	143,139	282
Harbor Mixed Use Transit Corridor Specific Plan	4,622	1,967,982	1,578
MainPlace Specific Plan	1,900	2,426,923	5,380
Metro East Mixed-Use Overlay Zone	5,551	4,685,947	12,258
Midtown Specific Plan	607	1,818,253	4,615
Transit Zoning Code	6,449	4,939,266	13,022
ALL OTHER AREAS OF THE CITY[3]	70,574	40,325,086	95,670
CITYWIDE TOTAL	115,053	72,967,816	170,416

Source: City of Santa Ana 2020.

[1] Only includes nonresidential building square footage.

[2] The figures shown on the row for the Adaptive Reuse Overlay represents parcels that are exclusively in the Adaptive Reuse Overlay boundary. Figures for parcels that are within the boundaries of both the Adaptive Reuse Overlay Zone and a specific plan, other special zoning, or focus area boundary are accounted for in the respective specific plan, other special zoning, or focus area.

[3] The City has included an assumption for growth on a small portion (5 percent) of residential parcels through the construction of second units, which is distributed throughout the city and is not concentrated in a subset of neighborhoods. Additional growth includes known projects in the pipeline and an increase of 10 percent in building square footage and employment for the professional office surrounding the Orange County Global Medical Center and along Broadway north of the Midtown Specific Plan.

1.3 PROJECT LOCATION

The City of Santa Ana is in the western central portion of Orange County, approximately 30 miles southwest of the city of Los Angeles and 10 miles northeast of the city of Newport Beach. The city is bordered by the city of Orange and unincorporated areas of Orange County to the north, the city of Tustin to the east, the cities of Irvine and Costa Mesa to the south, and the cities of Fountain Valley and Garden Grove to the west. In November 2019, the City annexed the 17th Street Island, a 24.78-acre area in the northeast portion of the city. The 17th Street Island is bounded by State Route 55 to the east, 17th Street to the south, and North Tustin Avenue to the west. The city also includes a portion of the Santa Ana River Drainage Channel within its sphere of influence (SOI). The city and its SOI are defined and referred to herein as the plan area.

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

1.4 MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM ORGANIZATION

CEQA requires that a reporting or monitoring program be adopted for the conditions of project approval that are necessary to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment (Public Resources Code 21081.6). The mitigation monitoring and reporting program is designed to ensure compliance with adopted mitigation measures during project implementation. For each mitigation measure recommended in the Draft PEIR, specifications are made herein that identify the action required and the monitoring and reporting that must occur. In addition, a responsible agency is identified for verifying compliance with individual conditions of approval contained in the MMRP. To effectively track and document the status of mitigation measures, a mitigation matrix has been prepared (see Table 1-3).

Table 1-3 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Requirements

Mitigation Measure	Timing	Responsible Implementing Party	Responsible Monitoring Party	Document Location (Monitoring Record)	Completion Date	
					Responsible Monitoring Party	Project Mitigation Monitor
5.2 AIR QUALITY						
AQ-1 Prior to discretionary approval by the City of Santa Ana for development projects subject to CEQA (California Environmental Quality Act) review (i.e., non-exempt projects), project applicants shall prepare and submit a technical assessment evaluating potential project construction-related air quality impacts to the City of Santa Ana for review and approval. The evaluation shall be prepared in conformance with South Coast Air Quality Management District (South Coast AQMD) methodology for assessing air quality impacts. If construction-related criteria air pollutants are determined to have the potential to exceed the South Coast AQMD's adopted thresholds of significance, the City of Santa Ana shall require that applicants for new development projects incorporate mitigation measures to reduce air pollutant emissions during construction activities. These identified measures shall be incorporated into all appropriate construction documents (e.g., construction management plans) submitted to the City and shall be verified by the City. Mitigation measures to reduce construction-related emissions could include, but are not limited to: · Require fugitive-dust control measures that exceed South Coast AQMD's Rule 403, such as: § Use of nontoxic soil stabilizers to reduce wind erosion. § Apply water every four hours to active soil-disturbing activities. § Tarp and/or maintain a minimum of 24 inches of freeboard on trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials. · Use construction equipment rated by the United States Environmental Protection Agency as having Tier 3 (model year 2006 or newer) or Tier 4 (model year 2008 or newer) emission limits, applicable for engines between 50 and 750 horsepower. · Ensure that construction equipment is properly serviced and maintained to the manufacturer's standards. · Limit nonessential idling of construction equipment to no more than five consecutive minutes.	Prior to discretionary approval	Project Applicant and Construction Contractor	City of Santa Ana Building Safety Division	City of Santa Ana Building Safety Division		

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

Table 1-3 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Requirements

	Mitigation Measure	Timing	Responsible Implementing Party	Responsible Monitoring Party	Document Location (Monitoring Record)	Completion Date	
						Responsible Monitoring Party	Project Mitigation Monitor
	· Limit on-site vehicle travel speeds on unpaved roads to 15 miles per hour. · Install wheel washers for all exiting trucks or wash off all trucks and equipment leaving the project area. · Use Super-Compliant VOC paints for coating of architectural surfaces whenever possible. A list of Super-Compliant architectural coating manufactures can be found on the South Coast AQMD's website.						
AQ-2	Prior to discretionary approval by the City of Santa Ana for development projects subject to CEQA (California Environmental Quality Act) review (i.e., non-exempt projects), project applicants shall prepare and submit a technical assessment evaluating potential project operation phase-related air quality impacts to the City of Santa Ana for review and approval. The evaluation shall be prepared in conformance with South Coast Air Quality Management District (South Coast AQMD) methodology in assessing air quality impacts. If operation-related air pollutants are determined to have the potential to exceed the South Coast AQMD's adopted thresholds of significance, the City of Santa Ana shall require that applicants for new development projects incorporate mitigation measures to reduce air pollutant emissions during operational activities. The identified measures shall be included as part of the conditions of approval. Possible mitigation measures to reduce long-term emissions could include, but are not limited to the following: · For site-specific development that requires refrigerated vehicles, the construction documents shall demonstrate an adequate number of electrical service connections at loading docks for plug-in of the anticipated number of refrigerated trailers to reduce idling time and emissions. · Applicants for manufacturing and light industrial uses shall consider energy storage and combined heat and power in appropriate applications to optimize renewable energy generation systems and avoid peak energy use.	Prior to the discretionary approval	Property Owner/ Developer	City of Santa Ana Building Safety Division	City of Santa Ana Building Safety Division		

Table 1-3 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Requirements

Mitigation Measure	Timing	Responsible Implementing Party	Responsible Monitoring Party	Document Location (Monitoring Record)	Completion Date	
					Responsible Monitoring Party	Project Mitigation Monitor
· Site-specific developments with truck delivery and loading areas and truck parking spaces shall include signage as a reminder to limit idling of vehicles while parked for loading/unloading in accordance with California Air Resources Board Rule 2845 (13 CCR Chapter 10 § 2485). · Provide changing/shower facilities as specified in Section A5.106.4.3 of the CALGreen Code (Nonresidential Voluntary Measures). · Provide bicycle parking facilities per Section A4.106.9 (Residential Voluntary Measures) of the CALGreen Code and Sec. 41-1307.1 of the Santa Ana Municipal Code. · Provide preferential parking spaces for low-emitting, fuel-efficient, and carpool/van vehicles per Section A5.106.5.1 of the CALGreen Code (Nonresidential Voluntary Measures). · Provide facilities to support electric charging stations per Section A5.106.5.3 (Nonresidential Voluntary Measures) and Section A5.106.8.2 (Residential Voluntary Measures) of the CALGreen Code. · Applicant-provided appliances (e.g., dishwashers, refrigerators, clothes washers, and dryers) shall be Energy Star–certified appliances or appliances of equivalent energy efficiency. Installation of Energy Star–certified or equivalent appliances shall be verified by Building & Safety during plan check. · Applicants for future development projects along existing and planned transit routes shall coordinate with the City of Santa Ana and Orange County Transit Authority to ensure that bus pad and shelter improvements are incorporated, as appropriate.						

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

Table 1-3 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Requirements

	Mitigation Measure	Timing	Responsible Implementing Party	Responsible Monitoring Party	Document Location (Monitoring Record)	Completion Date	
						Responsible Monitoring Party	Project Mitigation Monitor
AQ-3	Prior to discretionary approval by the City of Santa Ana, project applicants for new industrial or warehousing development projects that 1) have the potential to generate 100 or more diesel truck trips per day or have 40 or more trucks with operating diesel-powered transport refrigeration units, and 2) are within 1,000 feet of a sensitive land use (e.g., residential, schools, hospitals, or nursing homes), as measured from the property line of the project to the property line of the nearest sensitive use, shall submit a health risk assessment (HRA) to the City of Santa Ana for review and approval. The HRA shall be prepared in accordance with policies and procedures of the State Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment and the South Coast Air Quality Management District. If the HRA shows that the incremental cancer risk and/or noncancer hazard index exceed the respective thresholds, as established by the South Coast AQMD at the time a project is considered, the project applicant will be required to identify and demonstrate that best available control technologies for toxics (T-BACTs), including appropriate enforcement mechanisms, are capable of reducing potential cancer and noncancer risks to an acceptable level. T-BACTs may include, but are not limited to, restricting idling on-site, electrifying warehousing docks to reduce diesel particulate matter, or requiring use of newer equipment and/or vehicles. T BACTs identified in the HRA shall be identified as mitigation measures in the environmental document and/or incorporated into the site plan..	Prior to future discretionary project approval	Property Owner/ Developer	City of Santa Ana Building Safety Division	City of Santa Ana Building Safety Division		
AQ-4	Prior to discretionary approval by the City of Santa Ana, if it is determined that a development project has the potential to emit nuisance odors beyond the property line, an odor management plan shall be prepared by the project applicant and submitted to the City of Santa Ana for review and approval. Facilities that have the potential to generate nuisance odors include, but are not limited to: · Wastewater treatment plants · Composting, green waste, or recycling facilities · Fiberglass manufacturing facilities	Prior to future discretionary project approval	Property Owner/ Developer	City of Santa Ana Building Safety Division	City of Santa Ana Building Safety Division		

Table 1-3 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Requirements

Mitigation Measure	Timing	Responsible Implementing Party	Responsible Monitoring Party	Document Location (Monitoring Record)	Completion Date	
					Responsible Monitoring Party	Project Mitigation Monitor
· Painting/coating operations · Large-capacity coffee roasters · Food-processing facilities The odor management plan shall demonstrate compliance with the South Coast Air Quality Management District's Rule 402 for nuisance odors. The Odor Management Plan shall identify the best available control technologies for toxics (T-BACTs) that will be utilized to reduce potential odors to acceptable levels, including appropriate enforcement mechanisms. T-BACTs may include but are not limited to scrubbers (i.e., air pollution control devices) at the industrial facility. T-BACTs identified in the odor management plan shall be identified as mitigation measures in the environmental document prepared for the development project and/or incorporated into the project's site plan.						
5.3 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES						
BIO-1 For development or redevelopment projects that would disturb vegetated land or major stream and are subject to CEQA, a qualified biologist shall conduct an initial screening to determine whether a site-specific biological resource report is warranted. If needed, a qualified biologist shall conduct a field survey for the site and prepare a biological resource assessment for the project, including an assessment of potential impacts to sensitive species, habitats, and jurisdictional waters. The report shall recommend mitigation measures, as appropriate, to avoid or limit potential biological resource impacts to less than significant.	Concurrent with submittal of site development plans and prior to the issuance of grading permits	Project Applicant/ Developer	City of Santa Ana Building Safety Division	City of Santa Ana Building Safety Division		
5.4 CULTURAL RESOURCES						
CUL-1 **Identification of Historical Resources and Potential Project Impacts.** For structures 45 years or older, a Historical Resources Assessment (HRA) shall be prepared by an architectural historian or historian meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards. The HRA shall include: definition of a study area or area of potential effect, which will encompass the affected property and may include surrounding properties or historic district(s);	Prior to issuance of grading permits	Project Applicant/ Developer	City of Santa Ana Building Safety Division	City of Santa Ana Building Safety Division		

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

Table 1-3 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Requirements

	Mitigation Measure	Timing	Responsible Implementing Party	Responsible Monitoring Party	Document Location (Monitoring Record)	Completion Date	
						Responsible Monitoring Party	Project Mitigation Monitor
	an intensive level survey of the study area to identify and evaluate under federal, State, and local criteria significance historical resources that might be directly or indirectly affected by the proposed project; and an assessment of project impacts. The HRA shall satisfy federal and State guidelines for the identification, evaluation, and recordation of historical resources. An HRA is not required if an existing historic resources survey and evaluation of the property is available; however, if the existing survey and evaluation is more than five years old, it shall be updated.						
CUL-2	Use of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties shall be used to the maximum extent practicable to ensure that projects involving the relocation, conversion, rehabilitation, or alteration of a historical resource and its setting or related new construction will not impair the significance of the historical resource. Use of the Standards shall be overseen by an architectural historian or historic architect meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards. Evidence of compliance with the Standards shall be provided to the City in the form of a report identifying and photographing character-defining features and spaces and specifying how the proposed treatment of character-defining features and spaces and related construction activities will conform to the Standards. The Qualified Professional shall monitor the construction and provide a report to the City at the conclusion of the project. Use of the Secretary's Standards shall reduce the project impacts on historical resources to less than significant.	Prior to any disturbance of a historical resource, as determined by the intensive-level historical evaluation of a property	Property Owner or Project Applicant/ Developer	City of Santa Ana Building Safety Division	City of Santa Ana Building Safety Division		

Table 1-3 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Requirements

	Mitigation Measure	Timing	Responsible Implementing Party	Responsible Monitoring Party	Document Location (Monitoring Record)	Completion Date	
						Responsible Monitoring Party	Project Mitigation Monitor
CUL-3	**Documentation, Education, and Memorialization.** If the City determines that significant impacts to historical resources cannot be avoided, the City shall require, at a minimum, that the affected historical resources be thoroughly documented before issuance of any permits and may also require additional public education efforts and/or memorialization of the historical resource. Though demolition or alteration of a historical resource such that its significance is materially impaired cannot be mitigated to a less than significant level, recordation of the resource will reduce significant adverse impacts to historical resources to the maximum extent feasible. Such recordation should be prepared under the supervision of an architectural historian, historian, or historic architect meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards and should take the form of Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) documentation. At a minimum, this recordation should include an architectural and historical narrative; archival photographic documentation; and supplementary information, such as building plans and elevations and/or historic photographs. The documentation package should be reproduced on archival paper and should be made available to researchers and the public through accession by appropriate institutions such as the Santa Ana Library History Room, the South Central Coastal Information Center at California State University, Fullerton, and/or the HABS collection housed in the Library of Congress. Depending on the significance of the adversely affected historical resource, the City, at its discretion, may also require public education about the historical resource in the form of an exhibit, web page, brochure, or other format and/or memorialization of the historical resource on or near the proposed project site. If memorialized, such memorialization shall be a permanent installation, such as a mural, display, or other vehicle that recalls the location, appearance, and historical significance of the affected historical resource, and shall be designed in conjunction with a qualified architectural historian, historian, or historic architect.	Prior to the issuance of grading permits, and for any subsequent permit involving excavation to increased depth	Project Applicant/ Developer	City of Santa Ana Building Safety Division	City of Santa Ana Building Safety Division		

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

Table 1-3 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Requirements

	Mitigation Measure	Timing	Responsible Implementing Party	Responsible Monitoring Party	Document Location (Monitoring Record)	Completion Date	
						Responsible Monitoring Party	Project Mitigation Monitor
CUL-4	For projects with ground disturbance—e.g., grading, excavation, trenching, boring, or demolition that extend below the current grade—prior to issuance of any permits required to conduct ground-disturbing activities, the City shall require an Archaeological Resources Assessment be conducted under the supervision of an archaeologist that meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professionally Qualified Standards in either prehistoric or historic archaeology. Assessments shall include a California Historical Resources Information System records search at the South Central Coastal Information Center and of the Sacred Land Files maintained by the Native American Heritage Commission. The records searches will determine if the proposed project area has been previously surveyed for archaeological resources, identify and characterize the results of previous cultural resource surveys, and disclose any cultural resources that have been recorded and/or evaluated. If unpaved surfaces are present within the project area, and the entire project area has not been previously surveyed within the past 10 years, a Phase I pedestrian survey shall be undertaken in proposed project areas to locate any surface cultural materials that may be present.	Prior to the issuance of grading permits	Project Applicant/ Developer	City of Santa Ana Building Safety Division	City of Santa Ana Building Safety Division		
CUL-5	If potentially significant archaeological resources are identified, and impacts cannot be avoided, a Phase II Testing and Evaluation investigation shall be performed by an archaeologist who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards to determine significance prior to any ground-disturbing activities. If resources are determined significant or unique through Phase II testing, and site avoidance is not possible, appropriate site-specific mitigation measures shall be undertaken. These might include a Phase III data recovery program implemented by a qualified archaeologist and performed in accordance with the Office of Historical Preservation's "Archaeological Resource Management Reports (ARMR): Recommended Contents and Format" (OHP 1990) and "Guidelines for Archaeological Research Designs" (OHP 1991).	Prior to any ground disturbing activities	Project Applicant/ Developer	City of Santa Ana Building Safety Division	City of Santa Ana Building Safety Division		

Table 1-3 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Requirements

	Mitigation Measure	Timing	Responsible Implementing Party	Responsible Monitoring Party	Document Location (Monitoring Record)	Completion Date	
						Responsible Monitoring Party	Project Mitigation Monitor
CUL-6	If the archaeological assessment did not identify archaeological resources but found the area to be highly sensitive for archaeological resources, a qualified archaeologist and a Native American monitor approved by a California Native American Tribe identified by the Native American Heritage Commission as culturally affiliated with the project area shall monitor all ground-disturbing construction and pre-construction activities in areas with previously undisturbed soil of high sensitivity. The archaeologist shall inform all construction personnel prior to construction activities of the proper procedures in the event of an archaeological discovery. The training shall be held in conjunction with the project's initial on-site safety meeting and shall explain the importance and legal basis for the protection of significant archaeological resources. The Native American monitor shall be invited to participate in this training. In the event that archaeological resources (artifacts or features) are exposed during ground-disturbing activities, construction activities in the immediate vicinity of the discovery shall be halted while the resources are evaluated for significance by an archaeologist who meets the Secretary's Standards. and This will include tribal consultation and coordination with the Native American monitor shall be conducted in the case of a prehistoric archaeological resource or tribal resource. If the discovery proves to be significant, the long-term disposition of any collected materials should be determined in consultation with the affiliated tribe(s), where relevant; this could include curation with a recognized scientific or educational repository, transfer to the tribe, or respectful reinternment in an area designated by the tribe.	Prior to construction activities	Project Applicant/ Developer	City of Santa Ana Building Safety Division	City of Santa Ana Building Safety Division		

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

Table 1-3 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Requirements

	Mitigation Measure	Timing	Responsible Implementing Party	Responsible Monitoring Party	Document Location (Monitoring Record)	Completion Date	
						Responsible Monitoring Party	Project Mitigation Monitor
CUL-7	If an Archaeological Resources Assessment does not identify potentially significant archaeological resources but the site has moderate sensitivity for archaeological resources (Mitigation Measure CUL-4), an archaeologist who meets the Secretary's Standards shall be retained on call. The archaeologist shall inform all construction personnel prior to construction activities about the proper procedures in the event of an archaeological discovery. The pre-construction training shall be held in conjunction with the project's initial on-site safety meeting and shall explain the importance and legal basis for the protection of significant archaeological resources. In the event that archaeological resources (artifacts or features) are exposed during ground-disturbing activities, construction activities in the immediate vicinity of the discovery shall be halted while the on-call archaeologist is contacted. The resource shall be evaluated for significance and tribal consultation shall be conducted, in the case of a tribal resource. If the discovery proves to be significant, the long-term disposition of any collected materials should be determined in consultation with the affiliated tribe(s), where relevant.	Prior to construction activities	Project Applicant/ Developer	City of Santa Ana Building Safety Division	City of Santa Ana Building Safety Division		
5.6 GEOLOGY AND SOILS							
GEO-1	High Sensitivity. Projects involving ground disturbances in previously undisturbed areas mapped as having "high" paleontological sensitivity shall be monitored by a qualified paleontological monitor on a full-time basis. Monitoring shall include inspection of exposed sedimentary units during active excavations within sensitive geologic sediments. The monitor shall have authority to temporarily divert activity away from exposed fossils to evaluate the significance of the find and, if the fossils are determined to be significant, professionally and efficiently recover the fossil specimens and collect associated data. The paleontological monitor shall use field data forms to record pertinent location and geologic data, measure stratigraphic sections (if applicable), and collect appropriate sediment samples from any fossil localities..	During ground disturbing activities	Project Applicant/ Developer	City of Santa Ana Building Safety Division	City of Santa Ana Building Safety Division		

Table 1-3 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Requirements

Mitigation Measure		Timing	Responsible Implementing Party	Responsible Monitoring Party	Document Location (Monitoring Record)	Completion Date	
						Responsible Monitoring Party	Project Mitigation Monitor
GEO-2	Low-to-High Sensitivity. Prior to issuance of a grading permit for projects involving ground disturbance in previously undisturbed areas mapped with "low-to-high" paleontological sensitivity (see Figure 5.6-3), the project applicant shall consult with a geologist or paleontologist to confirm whether the grading would occur at depths that could encounter highly sensitive sediments for paleontological resources. If confirmed that underlying sediments may have high sensitivity, construction activity shall be monitored by a qualified paleontologist. The paleontologist shall have the authority to halt construction during construction activity as outlined in Mitigation Measure GEO-3.	Prior to the issuance of grading permits	Project Applicant/ Developer	City of Santa Ana Building Safety Division	City of Santa Ana Building Safety Division		
GEO-3	All Projects. In the event of any fossil discovery, regardless of depth or geologic formation, construction work shall halt within a 50-foot radius of the find until its significance can be determined by a qualified paleontologist. Significant fossils shall be recovered, prepared to the point of curation, identified by qualified experts, listed in a database to facilitate analysis, and deposited in a designated paleontological curation facility in accordance with the standards of the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology (2010). The most likely repository is the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County. The repository shall be identified and a curatorial arrangement shall be signed prior to collection of the fossils.	During ground disturbing activities	Project Applicant/ Developer	City of Santa Ana Building Safety Division	City of Santa Ana Building Safety Division		
5.7 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS							
GHG-1	The City of Santa Ana shall update the Climate Action Plan (CAP) every five years to ensure the City is monitoring the plan's progress toward achieving the City's greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction target and to require amendment if the plan is not achieving the specified level. The update shall consider a trajectory consistent with the GHG emissions reduction goal established under Executive Order S-03-05 for year 2050 and the latest applicable statewide legislative GHG emission reduction that may be in effect at the time of the CAP update (e.g., Senate Bill 32 for year 2030). The CAP update shall include the following:	Every five years	City of Santa Ana Building Safety Division in coordination with Project Applicant/ Developer	City of Santa Ana Building Safety Division	City of Santa Ana Building Safety Division		

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

Table 1-3 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Requirements

	Mitigation Measure	Timing	Responsible Implementing Party	Responsible Monitoring Party	Document Location (Monitoring Record)	Completion Date	
						Responsible Monitoring Party	Project Mitigation Monitor
	· GHG inventories of existing and forecast year GHG levels. · Tools and strategies for reducing GHG emissions to ensure a trajectory with the long-term GHG reduction goal of Executive Order S-03-05. · Plan implementation guidance that includes, at minimum, the following components consistent with the proposed CAP: § Administration and Staffing § Finance and Budgeting § Timelines for Measure Implementation § Community Outreach and Education § Monitoring, Reporting, and Adaptive Management § Tracking Tools Furthermore, the following measures will be considered when the City updates the Climate Action Plan: · Measures to protect the most vulnerable populations · Measure to increase carbon sinks · Standards for electric vehicle parking · Standards for construction projects						
5.12 NOISE							
N-1	Construction contractors shall implement the following measures for construction activities conducted in the City of Santa Ana. Construction plans submitted to the City shall identify these measures on demolition, grading, and construction plans submitted to the City: The City of Santa Ana Planning and Building Agency shall verify that grading, demolition, and/or construction plans submitted to the City include these notations prior to issuance of demolition, grading, and/or building permits. · Construction activity is limited to the hours: Between 7 AM to 8 PM Monday through Saturday, as prescribed in Municipal Code Section 18-314(e). Construction is prohibited on Sundays. · During the entire active construction period, equipment and trucks used for project construction shall use the best-available noise control techniques (e.g., improved mufflers, equipment re-design,	Prior to issuance of demolition, grading, and/or building permits	Project Applicant/ Developer and Architect	City of Santa Ana Building Safety Division	City of Santa Ana Building Safety Division		

Table 1-3 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Requirements

Mitigation Measure	Timing	Responsible Implementing Party	Responsible Monitoring Party	Document Location (Monitoring Record)	Completion Date	
					Responsible Monitoring Party	Project Mitigation Monitor
use of intake silencers, ducts, engine enclosures, and acoustically attenuating shields or shrouds), wherever feasible. · Impact tools (e.g., jack hammers and hoe rams) shall be hydraulically or electrically powered wherever possible. Where the use of pneumatic tools is unavoidable, an exhaust muffler on the compressed air exhaust shall be used along with external noise jackets on the tools. · Stationary equipment, such as generators and air compressors shall be located as far as feasible from nearby noise-sensitive uses. · Stockpiling shall be located as far as feasible from nearby noise-sensitive receptors. · Construction traffic shall be limited, to the extent feasible, to approved haul routes established by the City Planning and Building Agency. · At least 10 days prior to the start of construction activities, a sign shall be posted at the entrance(s) to the job site, clearly visible to the public, that includes permitted construction days and hours, as well as the telephone numbers of the City's and contractor's authorized representatives that are assigned to respond in the event of a noise or vibration complaint. If the authorized contractor's representative receives a complaint, he/she shall investigate, take appropriate corrective action, and report the action to the City. · Signs shall be posted at the job site entrance(s), within the on-site construction zones, and along queueing lanes (if any) to reinforce the prohibition of unnecessary engine idling. All other equipment shall be turned off if not in use for more than 5 minutes. · During the entire active construction period and to the extent feasible, the use of noise-producing signals, including horns, whistles, alarms, and bells, shall be for safety warning purposes only. The construction manager shall use smart back-up alarms, which automatically adjust the alarm level based on the						

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

Table 1-3 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Requirements

	Mitigation Measure	Timing	Responsible Implementing Party	Responsible Monitoring Party	Document Location (Monitoring Record)	Completion Date	
						Responsible Monitoring Party	Project Mitigation Monitor
	background noise level or switch off back-up alarms and replace with human spotters in compliance with all safety requirements and laws. · Erect temporary noise barriers (at least as high as the exhaust of equipment and breaking line-of-sight between noise sources and sensitive receptors), as necessary and feasible, to maintain construction noise levels at or below the performance standard of 80 dBA Leq. Barriers shall be constructed with a solid material that has a density of at least 4 pounds per square foot with no gaps from the ground to the top of the barrier.						
N-2	Prior to issuance of a building permit for a project requiring pile driving during construction within 135 feet of fragile structures, such as historical resources, 100 feet of non-engineered timber and masonry buildings (e.g., most residential buildings), or within 75 feet of engineered concrete and masonry (no plaster); or a vibratory roller within 25 feet of any structure, the project applicant shall prepare a noise and vibration analysis to assess and mitigate potential noise and vibration impacts related to these activities. This noise and vibration analysis shall be conducted by a qualified and experienced acoustical consultant or engineer. The vibration levels shall not exceed Federal Transit Administration (FTA) architectural damage thresholds (e.g., 0.12 inches per second [in/sec] peak particle velocity [PPV] for fragile or historical resources, 0.2 in/sec PPV for non-engineered timber and masonry buildings, and 0.3 in/sec PPV for engineered concrete and masonry). If vibration levels would exceed this threshold, alternative uses such as drilling piles as opposed to pile driving and static rollers as opposed to vibratory rollers shall be used. If necessary, construction vibration monitoring shall be conducted to ensure vibration thresholds are not exceeded.	Prior to the issuance of building permits	Project Applicant/ Developer	City of Santa Ana Building Safety Division	City of Santa Ana Building Safety Division		
N-3	New residential projects (or other noise-sensitive uses) located within 200 feet of existing railroad lines shall be required to conduct a groundborne vibration and noise evaluation consistent with Federal Transit Administration (FTA)-approved methodologies.	Prior to the issuance of building permits	Project Applicant/ Developer	City of Santa Ana Building Safety Division	City of Santa Ana Building Safety Division		

Table 1-3 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Requirements

	Mitigation Measure	Timing	Responsible Implementing Party	Responsible Monitoring Party	Document Location (Monitoring Record)	Completion Date	
						Responsible Monitoring Party	Project Mitigation Monitor
N-4	During the project-level California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) process for industrial developments under the General Plan Update or other projects that could generate substantial vibration levels near sensitive uses, a noise and vibration analysis shall be conducted to assess and mitigate potential noise and vibration impacts related to the operations of that individual development. This noise and vibration analysis shall be conducted by a qualified and experienced acoustical consultant or engineer and shall follow the latest CEQA guidelines, practices, and precedents.	Prior to the issuance of building permits	Project Applicant/ Developer and Acoustical Engineer	City of Santa Ana Building Safety Division	City of Santa Ana Building Safety Division		
5.16 TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES							
CUL-4	For projects with ground disturbance—e.g., grading, excavation, trenching, boring, or demolition that extend below the current grade—prior to issuance of any permits required to conduct ground-disturbing activities, the City shall require an Archaeological Resources Assessment be conducted under the supervision of an archaeologist that meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professionally Qualified Standards in either prehistoric or historic archaeology. Assessments shall include a California Historical Resources Information System records search at the South Central Coastal Information Center and of the Sacred Land Files maintained by the Native American Heritage Commission. The records searches will determine if the proposed project area has been previously surveyed for archaeological resources, identify and characterize the results of previous cultural resource surveys, and disclose any cultural resources that have been recorded and/or evaluated. If unpaved surfaces are present within the project area, and the entire project area has not been previously surveyed within the past 10 years, a Phase I pedestrian survey shall be undertaken in proposed project areas to locate any surface cultural materials that may be present.	Prior to the issuance of grading permits	Project Applicant/ Developer	City of Santa Ana Building Safety Division	City of Santa Ana Building Safety Division		

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

Table 1-3 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Requirements

	Mitigation Measure	Timing	Responsible Implementing Party	Responsible Monitoring Party	Document Location (Monitoring Record)	Completion Date	
						Responsible Monitoring Party	Project Mitigation Monitor
CUL-5	If potentially significant archaeological resources are identified, and impacts cannot be avoided, a Phase II Testing and Evaluation investigation shall be performed by an archaeologist who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards to determine significance prior to any ground-disturbing activities. If resources are determined significant or unique through Phase II testing, and site avoidance is not possible, appropriate site-specific mitigation measures shall be undertaken. These might include a Phase III data recovery program implemented by a qualified archaeologist and performed in accordance with the Office of Historical Preservation's "Archaeological Resource Management Reports (ARMR): Recommended Contents and Format" (OHP 1990) and "Guidelines for Archaeological Research Designs" (OHP 1991).	Prior to any ground disturbing activities	Project Applicant/ Developer	City of Santa Ana Building Safety Division	City of Santa Ana Building Safety Division		
CUL-6	If the archaeological assessment did not identify archaeological resources but found the area to be highly sensitive for archaeological resources, a qualified archaeologist shall monitor all ground-disturbing construction and pre-construction activities in areas with previously undisturbed soil. The archaeologist shall inform all construction personnel prior to construction activities of the proper procedures in the event of an archaeological discovery. The training shall be held in conjunction with the project's initial on-site safety meeting and shall explain the importance and legal basis for the protection of significant archaeological resources. In the event that archaeological resources (artifacts or features) are exposed during ground-disturbing activities, construction activities in the immediate vicinity of the discovery shall be halted while the resources are evaluated for significance by an archaeologist who meets the Secretary's Standards, and tribal consultation shall be conducted in the case of a tribal resource. If the discovery proves to be significant, the long-term disposition of any collected materials should be determined in consultation with the affiliated tribe(s), where relevant; this could include curation with a recognized scientific or educational repository, transfer to the tribe, or respectful reinternment in an area designated by the tribe.	Prior to construction activities	Project Applicant/ Developer	City of Santa Ana Building Safety Division	City of Santa Ana Building Safety Division		

Table 1-3 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Requirements

	Mitigation Measure	Timing	Responsible Implementing Party	Responsible Monitoring Party	Document Location (Monitoring Record)	Completion Date	
						Responsible Monitoring Party	Project Mitigation Monitor
CUL-7	If an Archaeological Resources Assessment does not identify potentially significant archaeological resources but the site has moderate sensitivity for archaeological resources (Mitigation Measure CUL-4), an archaeologist who meets the Secretary's Standards shall be retained on call. The archaeologist shall inform all construction personnel prior to construction activities about the proper procedures in the event of an archaeological discovery. The pre-construction training shall be held in conjunction with the project's initial on-site safety meeting and shall explain the importance and legal basis for the protection of significant archaeological resources. In the event that archaeological resources (artifacts or features) are exposed during ground-disturbing activities, construction activities in the immediate vicinity of the discovery shall be halted while the on-call archaeologist is contacted. The resource shall be evaluated for significance and tribal consultation shall be conducted, in the case of a tribal resource. If the discovery proves to be significant, the long-term disposition of any collected materials should be determined in consultation with the affiliated tribe(s), where relevant.	Prior to construction activities	Project Applicant/ Developer	City of Santa Ana Building Safety Division	City of Santa Ana Building Safety Division		

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

This page intentionally left blank.

EXHIBIT 2

RESOLUTION NO. 2020-xx

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SANTA ANA APPROVING GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 2020-06 FOR THE COMPREHENSIVE UPDATE TO THE SANTA ANA GENERAL PLAN

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SANTA ANA AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. The City Council of the City of Santa Ana hereby finds, determines and declares as follows:

WHEREAS, Article 5 of Chapter 3 of Division 1 of Title 7 (commencing with Section 65300) of the Government Code requires the City to prepare and adopt a comprehensive, long-term general plan for the physical development of the City; and

WHEREAS, in 1982, the City of Santa Ana last completed a comprehensive update to the General Plan; and

WHEREAS, various elements of the General Plan have been amended and adopted from time to time; and

WHEREAS, the City of Santa Ana seeks to adopt a comprehensive update to the Santa Ana General Plan; and

WHEREAS, the City created a General Plan Advisory Group (GPAG) to formulate the five Core Values of Culture, Sustainability, Health, Education and Equity that were developed to be interwoven throughout the document; and,

WHEREAS, per SB 1000, the City is required to address Environmental Justice in the General Plan update due to a number of disadvantaged communities located within the City; and,

WHEREAS, the goals, policies, and implementation items associated with environmental justice have been selectively placed within the majority of the updated Elements due to their importance; and,

WHEREAS, the Project as currently proposed entails, among other things, (1) the revision to the State mandated Elements of the General Plan; (2) the inclusion of optional Elements to the General Plan; (3) approval of General Plan Amendment (GPA) No. 2020-06, which would result in a comprehensive update to the existing General Plan; and

WHEREAS, the General Plan is a community-wide vision document that is intended to address and respond to community needs, with staff conducting outreach with community members about the process to as wide an audience as possible; and,

WHEREAS, over the past five years, an extensive public outreach campaign to engage the public was conducted to supplement the feedback, input and direction for the comprehensive update to the General Plan. Public outreach efforts included hosting over 60 community meetings and workshops; hosting individual community workshops within each of the five Focus Areas with over 300 residents, business leaders, and community stakeholders participating in the workshops; distributing an online community survey with over 650 respondents to collect input on the content of the General Plan; the mailing of approximately 44,000 informational flyers to property owners and tenants; presentations at neighborhood Communication Linkages (CommLink) meetings; outreach meetings with Environmental Justice groups (Madison Park Neighborhood Association, Logan Neighborhood Association, Artesia-Pilar Neighborhood Association); and, attendance at approximately 100 Cares events (daily neighborhood functions and evening City Park events) from late-August through the end of October within Environmental Justice communities to discuss the General plan update with residents; and,

WHEREAS, Environmental Impact Report No. 2020-03 (State Clearinghouse/SCH No. 2020029087) ("EIR") for the proposed General Plan update was circulated between August 3, 2020 and September 16, 2020; and

WHEREAS, due to feedback from the community, the comment period was extended another 20-days and closed on October 6, 2020; and

WHEREAS, on August 3, 2020, the City invited recognized Native American tribes to engage in consultation regarding the proposed General Plan Amendment pursuant to Government Code Section 65352.3; and

WHEREAS, on August 4, 2020, the City received a comment letter from the Juanero Band of Mission Indians, with the group providing comments but not requesting to consult with the City, with comments responded to in the Final EIR; and

WHEREAS, during the public comment period, Planning Commission work-study sessions were held on August 24, 2020 and September 14, 2020 where staff presented the proposed General Plan update and the Draft EIR for review and comment; and

WHEREAS, on November 9, 2020, the Planning Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing to consider the EIR and General Plan Amendment No. 2020-06. After hearing all relevant testimony from staff, the public and the City's consultant team, the Planning Commission voted to recommend that the City Council certify the EIR and adopt the findings of fact, the statement of overriding considerations and the mitigation monitoring and reporting program and approve the Project; and

WHEREAS, the "EIR" consists of the Final EIR and its attachments and appendices, as well as the Draft EIR and its attachments and appendices (as modified by the Final EIR); and

WHEREAS, on November 20, 2020, the City gave public notice of a City Council public hearing for consideration of Environmental Impact Report No. 2020-03 (State Clearinghouse No. 2020029087) by noticing in the Orange County Register, a newspaper of general circulation within the City of Santa Ana, and by mailing to owners of property and residents within 500 feet of the five Focus Areas, those listed in the Permanent Notification Binder, those listed on the Notice of Availability distribution list, and those listed on the General Plan interest list; and

WHEREAS, on December 1, 2020, the City Council conducted a duly noticed public hearing to consider the EIR and General Plan Amendment No. 2020-06, at which hearing members of the public were afforded an opportunity to comment upon Environmental Impact Report No. 2020-03. After hearing all relevant testimony from staff, the public and the City's consultant team, the City Council voted to certify the EIR, adopt the findings of fact, the statement of overriding considerations and the mitigation monitoring and reporting program and approve the Project.

NOW THEREFORE, THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SANTA ANA DOES RESOLVE, DETERMINE, FIND, AND ORDER AS FOLLOWS:

Section 2. CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT: The City Council has reviewed, certified and adopted Environmental Impact Report No. 2020-03, adopted the Findings of Fact, the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP), and Statement of Overriding Consideration for the proposed Project, including General Plan Amendment No. 2020-06.

Section 3. GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT: The General Plan Amendment consists of amendments to 11 Elements of the General Plan and text updates, as shown in Exhibit A, attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference.

Section 4. LOCATION OF DOCUMENTS: The General Plan Amendment, Environmental Impact Report and all supporting documents are online, and on file and available for public review at Santa Ana City Hall, 20 Civic Center Plaza, Santa Ana, California 92702.

Section 5. GENERAL PLAN CONSISTENCY: The City Council hereby finds that the proposed General Plan Amendment is compatible with the objectives, policies, and general plan land use programs specified in the General Plan for the City of Santa Ana in that:

A. The City of Santa Ana has officially adopted a General Plan.

B. The proposed Project is a comprehensive update to the current General Plan. The current General Plan will be consolidated into 12 elements, with 11 Elements being comprehensively updated including the Community Element, the Mobility Element, the Economic Prosperity Element, the Public Services Element, the Conservation Element, the Open Space Element, the Noise Element, the Safety Element, the Land Use Element, the Historic Preservation Element, and the Urban Design Element.

C. The Housing Element is on a separate update schedule and will be updated in 2021 in compliance with State law.

D. The new and updated goals/objectives and policies of the General Plan will be coordinated and consistent throughout the General Plan document.

E. The proposed General Plan Amendment will not adversely affect the public health, safety, and welfare in that the General Plan Amendment is a comprehensive update to the existing General Plan that is intended to address issues such as incompatible land uses on adjacent properties, inconsistencies between General Plan goals or policies, and will mitigate adverse impacts to the environment.

Section 6. CITY COUNCIL ACTION: The City Council hereby takes the following action:

1. The City Council approves General Plan Amendment No. 2020-06 as set forth in Exhibit A, attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference, subject to compliance with the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, and upon satisfaction of the conditions set forth below:

   A. The General Plan Amendment shall not take effect unless and until Environmental Impact Report No. 2020-03 is certified by the City Council.

   B. General Plan Amendment No. 2020-06 shall not take effect unless and until the City Council overrules the Determination of Inconsistency by the Airport Land Use Commission.

Section 7. EXECUTION OF RESOLUTION. The Mayor shall sign this Resolution and the Clerk of the Council shall attest and certify to the adoption thereof.

ADOPTED this ____ day of_____, 2020.

_____
Miguel A. Pulido
Mayor

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
Sonia R. Carvalho
City Attorney

By:_____
Lisa Storck
Assistant City Attorney

AYES: Councilmembers _____

NOES: Councilmembers _____

ABSTAIN: Councilmembers _____

NOT PRESENT: Councilmembers _____

CERTIFICATE OF ATTESTATION AND ORIGINALITY

I, DAISY GOMEZ, Clerk of the Council, do hereby attest to and certify the attached Resolution No. 2020-xx to be the original resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Santa Ana on _____, 2020.

Date: _____

_____
Daisy Gomez, Clerk of the Council
City of Santa Ana

EXHIBIT 3

EIR No. 2020-03 and GPA No. 2020-06

Comprehensive Update to the General Plan

The Final EIR and Technical Appendices are available online at:

https://www.santa-ana.org/general-plan/general-plan-environmental-documents

Physical copies are also available for viewing by appointment only. Please contact PlanningDepartment@santa-ana.org before visiting the Planning Division public counter located at:

20 Civic Center Plaza, Santa Ana, CA 92701

EXHIBIT 3 – Link to EIR

EXHIBIT 4

EIR No. 2020-03 and GPA No. 2020-06

Comprehensive Update to the General Plan

The Updated General Plan Elements are available online at:

https://www.santa-ana.org/general-plan/draft-documents

Physical copies are also available for viewing by appointment only. Please contact PlanningDepartment@santa-ana.org before visiting the Planning Division public counter located at:

20 Civic Center Plaza, Santa Ana, CA 92701

EXHIBIT 4 – Link to General Plan Elements