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1. Introduction

The proposed Kingdom Halls project site is located at 23061 and 23071 El Toro Road, on the north side of El Toro Road, approximately 800 feet southwest of the intersection of Jeronimo Road, and immediately northeast of the existing railroad tracks. The proposed project includes a General Plan Amendment, a Zone Change, a Site Development Permit, and a Tentative Parcel Map to divide the property into two lots and develop two Kingdom Hall religious buildings and related facilities on the larger 2.30-acre parcel.

Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), an Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) has been prepared for the proposed project which indicates the project would not have a significant effect on the environment if the mitigation measures outlined in Section 3, below, and agreed to by the project applicant, are incorporated into the project as planned.

The Draft IS/MND was made available for public review and comment pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15070. The public review period commenced on January 4, 2019 and concluded on January 23, 2019. The IS/MND and supporting attachments were available for review by the general public at:

- City of Lake Forest Development Services Department, 25550 Commercentre Drive, Suite 100, Lake Forest, California 92630
- City of Lake Forest website, www.lakeforestca.gov
- Foothill Ranch Branch Library, located at 27002 Cabriole Way, Lake Forest
- El Toro Library, located at 24672 Raymond Way, Lake Forest
2. Responses to Comments

As outlined above, the Draft IS/MND was available for public review from January 4, 2019 through January 23, 2019. During that time, comments were received on the IS/MND from seven interested public agencies and private parties. The following persons, firms, or agencies submitted comments on the IS/MND:

Comment Letter A
Tamera Rivers, Management Analyst
Orange County Fire Authority (OCFA)
January 9, 2019

Comment Letter B
Patricia Martz, Ph.D., President
California Cultural Resource Preservation Alliance, Inc.
January 12, 2019

Comment Letter C
Andrea and Keith Butz
January 13, 2019

Comment Letter D
Gerry and Donna Ojeda
January 13, 2019

Comment Letter E
Fiona M. Sanchez, Director of Water Resources
Irvine Ranch Water District (IRWD)
January 22, 2019

Comment Letter F
Justin Equina, Associate Planner
City of Irvine
January 23, 2019

Comment Letter G
Frank and Edith Gomez
January 24, 2018

The following pages contain the correspondence received on the project. Each comment contained in the letters has been assigned an alpha-numeric designation (e.g., C-2). Responses are provided following each letter with the alpha-numeric designations repeated to correlate with the comments and responses.

Changes have been made to the IS/MND in response to public comments, and to provide minor clarifications and corrections to the document. The changes are presented in strikeout/underline format to clearly reflect the changes made. Taken together, the revised IS/MND and this document constitute the Final Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration for the proposed Kingdom Halls project. The documents indicate that with mitigation, the project will not have a significant impact on the environment.
January 9, 2019

City of Lake Forest
Community Development Department
Attn: Jennifer Mansur, Associate Planner
25550 Commercentre Drive, Suite 100
Lake Forest, CA 92630

Ref: Mitigated Negative Declaration 23061 and 23071 El Toro Rd

Dear Jennifer Mansur:

Thank you for the opportunity to review the subject document. The Orange County Fire Authority (OCFA) provides fire protection and emergency medical services response to the project area. Services include: structural fire protection, emergency medical and rescue services, education and hazardous material response. OCFA also participates in disaster planning as it relates to emergency operations, which includes high occupant areas and schools sites and may participate in community disaster drills planned by others. Resources are deployed based upon a regional service delivery system, assigning personnel and equipment to emergency incidents without regard to jurisdictional boundaries. The equipment used by the department has the versatility to respond to both urban and wildland emergency conditions.

As stated on page 50 Project plans would need to be reviewed and approved by OCFA and the project would contribute development impact fees to OCFA for the development of future fire facilities. Therefore, the project’s impact on fire protection would be less than significant.

We believe the projects impact on fire services will be reduced with the following Measures:

- Prior to approval of any subdivision or comprehensive plan approval for a project, the designated site developer may be required to enter into a Secured Fire Protection Agreement with the Orange County Fire Authority.
  - This Agreement shall specify the developer’s pro-rata fair share funding of capital improvements necessary to establish adequate fire protection facilities and equipment, and/or personnel. Said agreement shall be reached as early as possible in the planning process, preferably for each phase or land use sector of the project, rather than on a parcel by parcel basis.
- The project is subject to review by the City and the OCFA for various construction document plan checks for the applicable fire life safety codes and regulations. The project will be subject to the 2016 editions of the CBC, CFC and related codes.
- Structures of this size and occupancy are required to have automatic fire sprinkler systems designed per NFPA 13 as required in the 2016 CBC, CFC.

Serving the Cities of: Aliso Viejo • Brea • Cypress • Dana Point • Irvine • Laguna Hills • Laguna Niguel • Laguna Woods • Lake Forest • La Palma
- Los Alamitos • Mission Viejo • Placentia • Rancho Santa Margarita • San Clemente • San Juan Capistrano • Seal Beach • Santa Ana • Stanton • Tustin
- Villa Park • Westminster • Yorba Linda • and Unincorporated Areas of Orange County

RESIDENTIAL SPRINKLERS AND SMOKE DETECTORS SAVE LIVES
- A water supply system to supply fire hydrants and automatic fire sprinkler systems is required. Fire flow and hydrant spacing shall meet the minimums identified in the codes. Please refer to the California Fire Code Appendix section. These tables are also located in OCFA Guideline B09, Attachment 23.

- Fire apparatus and personnel access to and around structures shall meet the minimum development standards of the OCFA and California Fire Code requirements. Please reference Section 2 of the OCFA’s Guideline B-09 at [www.ocfa.org](http://www.ocfa.org) (see attached)

- If the project scope includes or requires the installation of traffic signals on public access ways, these improvements shall include the installation of optical preemption devices.

- Any occupancy of any portion of the project will be after final approval has taken place

In addition, we would like to point out that all standard conditions with regard to development, including water supply, built in fire protection systems, road grades and width, access, building materials, and the like will be applied to this project at the time of plan submittal. Thank you for providing us with this information. Please contact me at 714-573-6199 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Tamera Rivers
Management Analyst
Strategic Services Section
tamyrivers@ocfa.org
714-573-6199
Responses to Comment Letter A  
Orange County Fire Authority  
January 9, 2019

A-1  Comment noted.

A-2  Section XIV of the Initial Study states that project plans will need to be reviewed and approved by the Orange County Fire Authority (OCFA) to ensure the project will have a less than significant impact on fire protection services. In addition, the following mitigation measure has been added to the Initial Study to further ensure that all requirements of OCFA are met:

PUB-1  Prior to issuance of a grading permit: The applicant shall submit to the Community Development Department evidence of a Fire Protection Agreement approved by OCFA.
January 12, 2019

Jennifer Mansur, Associate Planner
City of Lake Forest Community Development Department
25550 Commercentre Drive, Suite 100
Lake Forest, CA 92630

Re: Notice of Intent to Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Kingdom Halls Project

Dear Ms. Mansur:

Thank you for the opportunity to review the above-mentioned Negative Declaration. We have reviewed the project description and Cultural Resources section and concur with the determinations that the project area has a low potential for the presence of archaeological resources and, if cultural materials are discovered during construction, Mitigation Measure CULT-1 would ensure that impacts to cultural resources would be less than significant.

Sincerely,

Patricia Martz, Ph.D.
President
Responses to Comment Letter B
California Cultural Resource Preservation Alliance, Inc.
January 12, 2019

B-1 Comment noted.
To: Mansur, Jennifer  
Subject: RE: Kingdom Halls Project Environmental Documentation (23061 and 23071 El Toro Road)

From: Andrea Butz [mailto:andreabutz@cox.net]  
Sent: Sunday, January 13, 2019 1:44 PM  
To: Mansur, Jennifer  
Subject: Kingdom Halls Project Environmental Documentation (23061 and 23071 El Toro Road)

Hello Jennifer,

We are the homeowners at 23061 Stearns Circle. The proposed Kingdom Halls project is directly behind our house. The current proposal indicates that the Jehovah’s Witnesses would replace our current 6 foot wood fence with a 6 foot vinyl fence.

We believe that instead the Jehovah’s Witnesses should be installing an 8 foot block/concrete wall to ensure our family’s privacy (2 of our bedrooms directly face the backyard) as well as to ensure our safety from the driver’s in their new lots. Drivers would be driving directly on the back of our fence with just a bit of landscaping and the vinyl fence as a barrier. If anyone lost control of their vehicle, they would come into our yard. We also believe the higher fence would provide a better sound barrier from any noise from the project.

We would also like for the wall to be the first item built as part of the project to minimize any noise from the actual construction project.

Thank you very much.

Andrea and Keith Butz
Responses to Comment Letter C
Andrea and Keith Butz
January 13, 2019

C-1 The Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration does not identify any safety problems associated with the proposed project. Noise is addressed in Section XII of the Initial Study and includes Mitigation Measures NOI-1 through NOI-6 to minimize the effects of construction noise on nearby properties. The Initial Study further states that, with mitigation, noise generated during construction and operation of the project would not generate a significant noise impact on nearby residences, and no further mitigation is required. However, the applicant has agreed to construct a 6-foot-high solid concrete wall along the northeastern site boundary to address resident concerns. No further response needed.
From: Gerry Ojeda  [mailto:geojeda1060@cox.net]
Sent: Sunday, January 13, 2019 4:32 PM
To: Mansur, Jennifer
Cc: geojeda1060@cox.net
Subject: Comments and Concerns regarding the upcoming Kindom Hall Project

Good Afternoon Jennifer:

We are writing to you today regarding the upcoming Kingdom Hall project. We reside at 23051 Stearns Circle, Lake Forest which is directly located behind your current project. We would like to share our input and safety concerns with you prior to the actual construction starting. Due to the fact that we have a pool in our backyard, there will be cars driving and additional noise, we believe there should be at least an 8 ft block (concrete) wall installed that is “Finished” on both sides prior to the construction starting. If you are planning to install lighting, we would like to request downward lighting as oppose to outward lighting to preserve our privacy.

Can you please also provide your plans for securing the area (cameras, patrol, locked gates, etc.) because we are concerned about loitering and people parking cars during the off time hours. We would also like to know how often the facility will be in use (days and hours) and types of events that will take place. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to email us.

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to share our thoughts and we look forward to your response and consideration in this matter.

Best Regards,

Gerry and Donna Ojeda
949-813-3234
Responses to Comment Letter D
Gerry and Donna Ojeda
January 13, 2019

D-1 Refer to Response to Comment C-1 above.

D-2 As identified in Section I of the Initial Study and based on a site photometry plan prepared for the project, lighting associated with the project would not significantly impact surrounding land uses. In addition, the Site Development Permit Resolution includes the following standard condition to further address light trespass: *All outdoor parking lot lighting shall be installed so that lighting is confined to the site, and adjacent properties are protected from any glare.* A statement has been added to the Initial Study to reflect this condition.

D-3 The Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration identifies potential project environmental impacts, but does not address operational security issues. Security of the site will be addressed in the staff report for the development of this project.
January 22, 2019

Ms. Jennifer Mansur, Associate Planner
Development Services Department
City of Lake Forest
25550 Commercentre Drive, Suite 100
Lake Forest, CA 92630

Re: Notice of Intent – Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Kingdom Halls Project

Dear Ms. Mansur:

Irvine Ranch Water District (IRWD) has received and reviewed the Notice of Intent (NOI) Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) for the proposed Kingdom Halls Project, and offers the following comments.

The Draft MND correctly indicates that IRWD will be the domestic, and wastewater service provider for the project. The proposed project site is immediately adjacent to existing IRWD facilities (potable and sewer pipelines) so these facilities must be protected in place and IRWD must have full access to them during construction.

The proposed Kingdom Halls Project was not analyzed as part of the 2010 Lake Forest Sub-Area Master Plan (SAMP). Prior to development plan submittal and approval, the developer shall coordinate with IRWD to develop a technical memorandum or a SAMP addendum for this project. The study should address any improvements to the potable, non-potable and sewer systems associated with the proposed project. Please contact Eric Akiyoshi at (949) 453-5300 to further discuss these requirements.

IRWD appreciates the opportunity to review and provide input to this NOI/MND. If you have any questions or require additional information, please contact me at (949) 453-5325 or Jo Ann Corey, Environmental Compliance Specialist at (949) 453-5326.

Sincerely,

Fiona M. Sanchez
Director of Water Resources

Cc: Eric Akiyoshi, IRWD
    Jo Ann Corey, IRWD
Responses to Comment Letter E
Irvine Ranch Water District
January 22, 2019

E-1 Comment noted.

E-2 Section XVIII of the Initial Study correctly indicates that the Irvine Ranch Water District (IRWD) has determined it has adequate entitlements and capacity to provide water and wastewater services to the site. The Site Development Permit Resolution also includes the following condition to further address water and wastewater improvements needed for project development: **Prior to issuance of a grading permit: The applicant shall coordinate with the Irvine Ranch Water District to develop a technical memorandum or a SAMP addendum to address any improvements to the potable, non-potable, and sewer systems associated with the proposed project and provide evidence of such coordination to the Planning Division.** A statement has been added to the Initial Study to reflect this condition.
January 23, 2019

Ms. Jennifer Mansur  
City of Lake Forest  
Community Development Department  
Lake Forest, CA 92630

Subject: Notice of Intent to Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Kingdom Halls Project Located at 23061 and 23071 El Toro Road in the City of Lake Forest

Dear Ms. Mansur:

The City of Irvine is in receipt of a Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Kingdom Halls Project located at 23061 and 23071 El Toro Road in the City of Lake Forest. The project consists of developing two, 3,312 square foot, religious facilities on a 2.59 acre site. To accomplish this, the project proposes the following applications:

- A General Plan Amendment to change the property’s designation from Transportation Corridor to Public Facility.
- A Zone Change to change the property’s zoning designation from Agriculture (A1) to Community Commercial (CC).
- A Parcel Map to divide the property into two lots: one lot for Kingdom Hall and the other lot for Southern California Gas Company.
- A Site Development Permit for the development of the proposed religious buildings.

The City staff has completed its review and has no comments. If you have any questions, you may contact me at 949-724-6364 or at jequina@cityofirvine.org.

Sincerely,

Justin Equina  
Associate Planner

cc: Kerwin Lau, Manager of Planning Services  
    Bill Jacobs, Principal Planner  
    Farideh Lyons, Senior Transportation Analyst
Responses to Comment Letter F  
City of Irvine Community Development  
January 23, 2019  

F-1  Comment noted.
From: Frank Gomez [mailto:fgomez236@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, January 24, 2019 10:47 AM
To: Mansur, Jennifer
Subject: Fwd: Comments and concerns regarding the upcoming Kingdom Hall Project

Good Afternoon Jennifer:

My name is Frank Gomez and my wife Edith Gomez. We are writing to you today regarding the upcoming Kingdom Hall project. We reside at 23041 Stearns Circle, Lake Forest which is directly located behind your current project. We would like to share our input and safety concerns with you prior to the actual construction starting. Just like our neighbors at 23051 Stearns, we also have a pool. Our input and safety issues are similar to our neighbors who reside at 23051 Stearns. Due to the fact that we have a pool in our backyard, there will be cars driving and additional noise, we believe there should be at least an 8 ft block (concrete) wall installed that is “Finished” on both sides prior to the construction starting. If you are planning to install lighting, we would like to request downward lighting as oppose to outward lighting to preserve our privacy.

Can you please also provide your plans for securing the area (cameras, patrol, locked gates, etc.) because we are concerned about loitering and people parking cars during the off time hours. We would also like to know how often the facility will be in use (days and hours) and types of events that will take place.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to email us.

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to share our thoughts and we look forward to your response and consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

Frank and Edith Gomez

949-206-0953
Responses to Comment Letter G
Frank and Edith Gomez
January 24, 2019

G-1 Refer to Response to Comment C-1 above.

G-2 Refer to Response to Comment D-3 above.
3.  Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (California Public Resources Code §21081.6) requires that public agencies adopting a Mitigated Negative Declaration ensure that mitigation measures identified for a project are implemented following project approval through the preparation of a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP). This requirement ensures that potential environmental impacts are mitigated to below a level of significance. The City of Lake Forest City Council will be required to adopt the MMRP if the City Council approves the proposed Kingdom Halls project.

The MMRP checklist contained on the following pages lists those mitigation measures identified through the Initial Study process that are required to mitigate potential impacts below a level of significance. Measures are identified for Cultural Resources and Tribal Cultural Resources; Geology and Soils; Hazards and Hazardous Materials; Noise; and Public Services. For each mitigation measure, the party responsible for implementing the measure is identified, as well as the anticipated timeline for implementation. In addition, the party responsible for monitoring the mitigation measure and ensuring it is carried out is identified as well as the timing for monitoring. The MMRP also includes a column labeled “Mitigation Complete?” that can be used by the City to track each mitigation measure.

Minor changes to the MMRP, if any, may be made by the City provided the changes remain in accordance with CEQA. Changes may include, but are not limited to, reassignment of the implementing party, changes to the timing of mitigation, or minor changes to the mitigation measures themselves. Any changes would need to comply with the requirements of California Public Resources Code §21081.6.
### Table 1

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Implementation Responsibility</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Monitoring Responsibility</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Mitigation Complete?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CULT-1</td>
<td>If subsurface deposits believed to be cultural or human in origin are discovered during construction, all work must halt within a 50-foot radius of the discovery. An archaeological monitor or a Principal Investigator, meeting the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualification Standards for prehistoric and historic archaeology, shall be afforded a reasonable amount of time to evaluate the significance of the find. Work cannot continue at the discovery site until the archaeologist conducts sufficient research and data collection to make a determination that the resource is either 1) not cultural in origin; or 2) not potentially significant or eligible for listing on the NRHP or CRHR. If a potentially eligible resource is encountered, the archaeologist, the lead agency, and the project proponent shall arrange for either 1) total avoidance of the resource, if possible; or 2) test excavations to evaluate eligibility and, if eligible, total data recovery as mitigation. The determination shall be formally documented in writing and submitted to the lead agency as verification that the provisions in CEQA/National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) for managing unanticipated discoveries have been met. In the event that evidence of human remains is discovered, construction activities within 50 feet of the discovery will be halted or diverted, and the requirements above will be implemented. Depending on the occurrence, a larger radius may be necessary and will be required at the discretion of the on-site archaeologist. In addition, the provisions of §7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code, §5097.98 of the California Public Resources Code, and Assembly Bill 2641 will be implemented. When human remains are discovered, state law requires that the discovery be reported to the County Coroner (§7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code) and that reasonable protection measures be taken during construction to protect the discovery from disturbance (AB 2641). If the Coroner determines the remains are Native American, the Coroner notifies the NAHC, which then designates a Native American MLD for the project (§5097.98 of the California Public Resources Code).</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
<td>During construction</td>
<td>Lake Forest Planning Division</td>
<td>During construction</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure</td>
<td>Implementation Responsibility</td>
<td>Timing</td>
<td>Monitoring Responsibility</td>
<td>Mitigation Complete?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Resources Code). The MLD may not be the same person as the tribal monitor. The designated MLD then has 48 hours from the time access to the property is granted to make recommendations concerning treatment of the remains (AB 2641). If the landowner does not agree with the recommendations of the MLD, the NAHC can mediate (§5097.94 of the California Public Resources Code). If no agreement is reached, the landowner must rebury the remains where they will not be further disturbed (§5097.98 of the California Public Resources Code). This will also include either recording the site with the NAHC or the appropriate Information Center; using an open space or conservation zoning designation or easement; or recording a document with the county in which the property is located (AB 2641). Prior to issuance of any building permits, the applicant shall provide the City with either the required documentation from the archaeologist, as described in this mitigation measure, or a signed written statement from the contractor performing the grading activities, stating that no subsurface deposits, believed to be cultural or human origin, were discovered during grading activities.</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
<td>During construction</td>
<td>Lake Forest Planning Division</td>
<td>During construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULT-2</td>
<td>If subsurface paleontological resources (i.e. fossil remains) are discovered during construction, all work must halt within a 50-foot radius of the discovery and the City of Lake Forest shall be notified. The project applicant shall retain a City-approved paleontologist to assess the significance of the find. Impacts to any significant resources shall be mitigated to a less-than-significant level through methods determined adequate by the paleontologist and approved by the City. Prior to issuance of any building permits, the applicant shall provide the City with either a report of findings with an appended itemized inventory of specimens, or a signed written statement from the contractor performing the grading activities, stating that no paleontological resources were discovered during grading activities.</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
<td>Prior to issuance of grading permit</td>
<td>Lake Forest Engineering Division</td>
<td>Plan check</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEO-1</td>
<td>The project grading submitted to the City shall include notes and/or drawings demonstrating conformance with the following: All fill materials within the footprint of the proposed buildings shall</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
<td>Prior to issuance of grading permit</td>
<td>Lake Forest Engineering Division</td>
<td>Plan check</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
be removed, excavated, and thoroughly cleaned prior to backfill placement and/or construction. After removal of undocumented fill within the proposed building footprints, foundations and floor slab areas should be supported on engineered fill. The proposed buildings may be supported by shallow spread footings bearing on engineered fill extending to a minimum depth of 2 feet below the bottom of the footings or to the bottom of the undocumented fill encountered during construction, whichever is greater. The bottom of the over-excavation should be scarified, moisture conditions and compacted to the requirement in Section 4.2.4 of the Geotechnical Engineering Report prepared by Terracon and dated November 22, 2017. Due to the expansive nature of the clayey soils, the upper 18 inches of engineered fill placed beneath floor slabs should comprise low volume change import materials. Any deviation to the recommendations in the Geotechnical Report should be reviewed and approved by the Engineer of Record and the City prior to implementation.

### Hazards and Hazardous Materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Implementation Responsibility</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Monitoring Responsibility</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Mitigation Complete?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HAZ-1</td>
<td>Prior to issuance of a grading permit for the proposed project, a Construction Contingency Plan shall be developed by a qualified environmental professional in consultation with the City Engineer. At a minimum, the Construction Contingency Plan shall include guidance for handling, segregating, and characterizing potentially contaminated soil generated during grading activities to minimize impacts to worker safety and the environment. The Plan shall also identify that the Contractor must verify that all exported soils are not contaminated with hazardous materials above regulatory thresholds in consultation with a Phase II/Site Characterization Specialist. If export soils are determined to be contaminated above regulatory thresholds, the Phase II/Site Characterization Specialist shall recommend proper handling, use, and/or disposal of these soils.</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
<td>Prior to issuance of grading permit</td>
<td>Lake Forest City Engineer and Building Division</td>
<td>Plan check</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure</td>
<td>Implementation Responsibility</td>
<td>Timing</td>
<td>Monitoring Responsibility</td>
<td>Timing</td>
<td>Mitigation Complete?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOI-1</td>
<td>Equip all construction equipment, fixed or mobile, with properly operating and maintained mufflers consistent with manufacturers’ standards. Equipment should also utilize the best available noise control techniques (e.g., use of intake silencers, ducts, engine enclosures, and acoustically attenuating shields or shrouds, wherever feasible).</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
<td>Prior to issuance of grading permit</td>
<td>Lake Forest Building Division</td>
<td>During site inspections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOI-2</td>
<td>Place all stationary construction equipment so that emitted noise is directed away from sensitive receptors nearest the active project site.</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
<td>Prior to issuance of grading permit</td>
<td>Lake Forest Building Division</td>
<td>During site inspections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOI-3</td>
<td>Locate equipment staging in areas that would create the greatest possible distance between construction-related noise sources and noise-sensitive receptors nearest the active project site during all project construction.</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
<td>Prior to issuance of grading permit</td>
<td>Lake Forest Building Division</td>
<td>During site inspections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOI-4</td>
<td>Install temporary noise barriers around stationary noise sources (such as compressors) and locate stationary noise sources as far from adjacent or nearby sensitive receptors as possible.</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
<td>Prior to issuance of grading permit</td>
<td>Lake Forest Building Division</td>
<td>During site inspections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOI-5</td>
<td>Prohibit extended idling time of internal combustion engines.</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
<td>Prior to issuance of grading permit</td>
<td>Lake Forest Building Division</td>
<td>During site inspections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOI-6</td>
<td>Limit all noise producing construction activities to the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m. Monday through Saturday. No construction activity shall be allowed on Sundays and holidays.</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
<td>Prior to issuance of grading permit</td>
<td>Lake Forest Building Division</td>
<td>During site inspections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Services</td>
<td>Prior to issuance of a grading permit: The applicant shall submit evidence of approval by OCFA of an approved Fire Protection Agreement to the Planning Division.</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Prior to issuance of grading permit</td>
<td>Lake Forest Planning Division</td>
<td>Plan check</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Initial Study – Mitigated Negative Declaration

1. **Project Title:** Lake Forest Kingdom Halls
2. **Lead Agency:** City of Lake Forest
   Community Development Department
   Planning Division
   25550 Commercentre Drive, Suite 100
   Lake Forest, CA 92630
3. **Contact Person:** Jennifer Mansur, AICP, Associate Planner
   Phone: (949) 461-3472
   Email: jmansur@lakeforestca.gov
4. **Project Location:** 23061 and 23071 El Toro Road, Lake Forest, CA
   APN: 614-024-01
5. **Project Sponsor:** JW Congregation Support, Inc.
   681 N. Markwood Street
   Orange, CA 92687
6. **Existing General Plan Designation:** Transportation Corridor
7. **Existing Zoning:** A-1 – General Agriculture
8. **Description of Project:**

   The 2.59-acre project site located on the north side of El Toro Road, approximately 800 feet southwest of the intersection of Jeronimo Road, and immediately northeast of the existing railroad tracks (Figure 1 and Figure 2). The project site is predominantly vacant and level and contains only scattered pockets of invasive plant species. Southern California Gas Company has utilities on the northern portion of the property. The project site was previously used for many years as a train station in the early 1900s. During the 1990s, until approximately 2007, the site was used by Sun Pac Containers Inc., for the storage of large shipping containers. The project site was acquired by the City’s Redevelopment Agency in April of 2007 from the Orange County Transportation Authority. The property was transferred to the City’s Housing Authority prior to the dissolution of redevelopment agencies in the State of California. The site is presently owned by the City’s Housing Authority which intends to sell the property to the project applicant.

   The proposed project includes a General Plan Amendment (03-18-5133), Zone Change (03-18-5134, Site Development Permit (03-18-5137) and Tentative Parcel Map (03-18-5135) on a 2.59-acre site located at 23061 and 23071 El Toro Road. The Tentative Parcel Map would divide the 2.59-acre property into two lots, a 2.30-acre lot (Parcel 1) for two proposed Kingdom Hall religious buildings and related facilities, and a 0.29-acre parcel (Parcel A) at the northwestern limit of the site for the Southern California Gas Company which has facilities on the site. The proposed General Plan Amendment would change the General Plan Designation on the project site from Transportation Corridor to Public Facility, and the Zone Change would change the zoning on the site from A1 (Agriculture) to CC (Community Commercial) (Figure 3 and Figure 4). The Site Development Permit would allow development of religious facilities on the site.
Figure 1. Project Location
Figure 2. Aerial Photograph of Project Site
Figure 3. General Plan Amendment Map
Source: City of Lake Forest

**Figure 4.** Zone Change Map
The two Kingdom Hall buildings would be located along the western limit of Parcel 1, adjacent to the railroad right of way. The buildings would include a one-level structure with 3,312 square feet of floor area which would contain a library, office, two handicap-accessible restrooms, and an auditorium with 129 seats including 125 fixed seats and 4 wheelchair spaces. No kitchen facilities would be included. The buildings would be 19 feet 10¾ inches tall to the top of screened mechanical equipment closures. Building materials will include plaster with metal awnings and stone veneer in brown and beige colors (Figure 5 and Figure 6).

The remainder of Parcel 1 would contain a 128-space surface parking lot and landscaping. A 6-foot-high solid concrete wall would be constructed to separate the site from the residential uses on the northeast side of the site. The location of the wall along the northeast property line that is adjacent to the Forest Glen Apartments to be setback 5 feet from the property line. Access to the site would be through a parking lot serving a separate Kingdom Hall facility at 23051 El Toro Road.

No development is proposed on Parcel A, which contains exiting gas utilities.

Access to the site would be from an existing driveway and parking lot serving the existing Kingdom Hall facility at 23051 El Toro Road (see previous Figure 2). Operationally, the two Kingdom Hall buildings will be operated separately from each other and the existing facility but will be used for similar purposes. The Halls would be used for religious services, which will typically be held on Saturday and Sunday between the hours of 9:00 a.m. to 7:00 9:00 p.m. and weeknights from 7:00 p.m. to 9:15 p.m. The services would include singing, but there would be no amplified instruments or outdoor speakers. The Kingdom Halls will also be used for administrative purposes, small meetings, and the occasional weekend wedding or other group meetings. However, there would be no outdoor events on the property.

9. Surrounding Land Use(s) and Setting:

The project site is surrounded by residential, religious, commercial, and transportation land uses. Single-family residential development is located adjacent to the site on the northwest/northeast with the closest homes approximately 40 feet from the project boundary. To the east/southeast is the Forest Glen Apartment Community and the existing Kingdom Hall facility (23051 El Toro Road). El Toro Road is located south/southeast of the project site and is elevated over 20 feet above the site to accommodate the railroad tracks. An existing 40-foot-wide landscaped slope with multiple large eucalyptus trees is present between the project site and El Toro Road. The railroad tracks border the west/southwest project boundary with single- and multi-family residential development located further to the west.

10. Other Public Agencies Whose Approval Is Required:

None.

11. Consultation with California Native American Tribes:

None requested.
Figure 5. Tentative Parcel Map
Figure 6. Building Elevations
Environmental Factors Potentially Affected

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

☐ Aesthetics ☐ Agriculture and Forestry Resources ☐ Air Quality
☐ Biological Resources ☒ Cultural Resources ☒ Geology and Soils
☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions ☒ Hazards and Hazardous Materials ☐ Hydrology and Water Quality
☐ Land Use and Planning ☐ Mineral Resources ☐ Noise
☐ Population and Housing ☒ Public Services ☐ Recreation
☐ Transportation / Traffic ☒ Tribal Cultural Resources ☐ Utilities and Services Systems
☒ Mandatory Findings of Significance

Preparation:

This Initial Study for the Kingdom Halls project was prepared by:

[Signature]

Mary P. Wright, AICP, Planning Consultant
Determination: (to be completed by Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

☐ I find the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☒ I find that although the project could have a significant effect on the environment there would not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Jennifer Mansur, Associate Planner
December 31, 2018
Evaluation of Environmental Impacts

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project would not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).

2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.

3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries, an EIR is required.

4. “Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.” The Lead Agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from "Earlier Analyses," may be cross-referenced).

5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
   a) Earlier Analysis Used: Identify and state where they are available for review.
   b) Impacts Adequately Addressed: Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
   c) Mitigation Measures: For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

7. Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

8. This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from the checklist that are relevant to a project’s environmental effects in whatever format is selected.

9. The explanation of each issue should identify:
   a) The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
   b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significant.
I. Aesthetics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Substantially damage scenic resources, including scenic vistas from public parks and views from designated scenic highways or arterial roadways?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Create a new source of substantial night lighting that would result in “sky glow” (i.e. illumination of the night sky in urban areas) or “spill light” (i.e., light that falls outside of the area intended to be lighted) onto adjacent sensitive land uses?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Create a new source of substantial glare which would adversely affect daytime visibility and/or views in the area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings where:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) The project exceeds the allowed height or bulk regulations, or exceeds the prevailing height and bulk of existing structures?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) The project is proposed to have an architectural style or to use building materials that will be in vivid contrast to an adjacent development where that development had been constructed adhering to a common architectural style or theme?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) The project is located on a visually prominent site and, due to its height, bulk, architecture or signage, will be in vivid contrast to the surrounding development or environment degrading the visual unity of the area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) A project would include unscreened outdoor uses or materials?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) A project would result in the introduction of an architectural feature or building mass that conflicts with the character of the surrounding development?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis

a) **Would the project substantially damage scenic resources, including scenic vistas from public parks and views from designated scenic highways or arterial roadways?**

*No impact.* The City of Lake Forest General Plan does not discuss scenic vistas. However, El Toro Road is designated as a Scenic Highway by the Orange County General Plan. The portion of El Toro Road near the project site is further designated as a “landscape corridor” which, according to the City’s CEQA Significance Thresholds Guide, “traverses developed or developing areas and has been designated for special treatment to provide a pleasant driving environment as well as community environment.” There are no public parks in the immediate project vicinity and views from public parks would not be affected. The project site includes a vacant, graded pad surrounded by a railway, a road, and residential uses. With the exception of the railway to the west, there is limited visibility of the site due to existing trees, fences, and the elevation of El Toro Road approximately 20 to 30 feet above the project site. Development of the site would include the construction of two 3,312-square-foot buildings and related parking and landscaping and would be minimally visible from El Toro Road and other surrounding areas. Thus, the project would not adversely affect any scenic vistas, and no impact would occur.
b) **Would the project create a new source of substantial night lighting that would result in “sky glow” (i.e. illumination of the night sky in urban areas) or “spill light” (i.e., light that falls outside of the area intended to be lighted) onto adjacent sensitive land uses?**

*Less than significant impact.* Existing development, El Toro Road, and the railroad currently produce a moderate amount of nighttime lighting from interior and exterior building lighting, car headlights, and passing trains. The project site is currently vacant and does not generate light or glare. Lighting for the proposed project would include interior and exterior lighting typical of a religious use. A site photometry plan is included in the project plans (Appendix I, Exhibit ES-102) that shows a maximum of 6 foot-candles (along sidewalks) at the site. As shown on the site photometry plan, the proposed exterior lighting would be in the landscape median in the center of the parking lot and wall mounted on the proposed buildings. Parking lot lighting would not be located adjacent to residential areas and, as shown on the site photometry plan, there would not be any significant “spill light” on the adjacent properties. In addition, project conditions will require that all outdoor parking lot lighting is installed so that lighting is confined to the site. The site would not involve the generation of a significant amount of light or result in sky glow or spill light on adjacent areas or sensitive land uses, and a less than significant impact would result.

c) **Would the project create a new source of substantial glare which would adversely affect daytime visibility and/or views in the area?**

*Less than significant impact.* Regarding glare, building materials would be of non-reflective materials and are not anticipated to create glare. Glare could result from sunlight reflecting off automobile windshields on the site. However, the windshields are not expected to be a significant source of glare for nearby residents and would be partially screened by fencing and landscaping. In addition, project conditions will require that all outdoor parking lot lighting is installed so that lighting is confined to the site, and adjacent properties are protected from any glare. Thus, impacts related to the lighting and glare would be less than significant.

d) **Would the project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings where:**

1) **Would the project exceed the allowed height or bulk regulations, or exceed the prevailing height and bulk of existing structures?**

*No Impact.* The City of Lake Forest General Plan and Municipal Code do not contain bulk regulations per se. However, the General Plan includes maximum floor area ratios (FAR) for non-residential uses. Based upon the proposed Public Facility land use designation, the General Plan limits the maximum FAR to 1.2:1, which means that the total gross floor area of all buildings on a lot can be no more than 120% of total area of that lot. Based on a Parcel 1 site size of 110,251 square feet, the maximum allowable floor area of all buildings on the site is 132,301 square feet. The total gross floor area of the two proposed Kingdom Hall buildings would be 6,624 square feet, well below the maximum FAR allowed on the site. In addition, the buildings would stand 18 feet, 10¾ inches with roof screens extending up to 19 feet, 10¾ inches in height, which is less than the 65 feet in height allowed by the CC Zone. The buildings would be taller than some one-story single-family homes in the vicinity, but shorter than two story homes and apartments in the area. In addition, the buildings would be larger in size than single-family homes in the area but similar or smaller in bulk to some of the apartment buildings east of the site and the existing Kingdom Hall facility at 23051 El Toro Road. Thus, the project would not exceed the allowed FAR or height regulations of the City, or the prevailing height and bulk of structures in the immediate vicinity, and no impact would result.
2) **Would the project have an architectural style or use building materials that will be in vivid contrast to an adjacent development where that development had been constructed adhering to a common architectural style or theme?**

*No impact.* The project site is located in an urbanized area with a varied mix of architectural styles and building materials and no common architectural style or theme. The two proposed Kingdom Hall buildings would feature a simple design with exterior plaster, metal awnings, and stone veneer in earth tone colors. The buildings would be similar in nature to the existing religious facility at 23051 El Toro Road and would conform with the El Toro Design Guidelines. The buildings would not vividly contrast with nearby development, and no impact would result.

3) **Would the project be located on a visually prominent site and, due to its height, bulk, architecture or signage, be in vivid contrast to the surrounding development or environment degrading the visual unity of the area?**

*No impact.* The project site is not visually prominent as it is located 20 to 30 feet below the El Toro bridge and screened by surrounding topography, development, vegetation and fences. As outlined above, the proposed building design would be simple in nature and would not vividly contrast with the eclectic mix of architectural styles present in the area. No impact would result.

4) **Would the project include unscreened outdoor uses or materials?**

*Less than significant impact.* During construction, an assortment of equipment, vehicles and materials would be transported to, and stored on-site for use in the construction process and could result in unscreened uses or materials on the site. However, construction would be short term in nature, and any aesthetic impacts resulting from the storage of construction materials would be temporary.

During the operational phase of the project, the proposed buildings would include rooftop mechanical equipment that would be screened by rooftop enclosures. In addition, waste would be contained within a trash enclosure on the property and would not be visible from the parking lot or adjacent areas. No unscreened outdoor uses or materials would be stored on site, and a less than significant impact would result.

5) **Would the project result in the introduction of an architectural feature or building mass that conflicts with the character of the surrounding development?**

*No impact.* As outlined above, the proposed project includes two 1-story buildings in earth tone colors that would be similar or reduced in height and bulk compared to other larger structures in the area. The project would not significantly change the visual character in the project vicinity, and no impact would result.
II. Agriculture and Forestry Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to nonagricultural use?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis

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

**No impact.** Although currently vacant, the project site previously contained a train station and related uses and is located in an area considered urban in nature. According the State of California Department of Conservation 2014 Map of Important Farmland, the project site is located within an area designated “Urban and Built-Up Land” and is not considered Prime, Unique or Important Farmland. In addition, the project site does not currently contain agricultural uses and has not been used for farming in the recent past. Thus, no impact would result.

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

**Less than significant impact.** The project site is not under a Williamson Act contract that provides financial incentives to maintain property in agricultural use. The site is currently zoned A1 – General Agriculture. However, the site is not currently used for agricultural uses, nor has it been used for agricultural purposes in the recent history of the project site. The intent of the A1 zone at this location is as a holding zone until a more appropriate zone can be identified for the site. As outlined in the Lake Forest Municipal Code, Section 9.72.011, this zone “may be used as an interim zone in those areas which the General Plan may designate for more intensive urban uses in the future.” The project site is currently designated Transportation Corridor by the General Plan, which applies to property near major transportation corridors and does not anticipate agricultural uses. Thus, the project would have a less than significant impact.
c) **Would the project conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?**

*No impact.* The project site is not zoned or designated forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code §12220(g)) or timberland (as defined in Public Resources Code §4526). In addition, the project site is not designated or zoned for forestry or timberland resources. Thus, no impact would result.

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

*No impact.* The project site does not contain forest land, nor would it convert forest land to non-forest use. No impact would result.

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

*No impact.* The project site does not contain agricultural or forest lands, nor would it involve changes in the existing environment, which could result in conversion of agricultural or forest land to other uses. Thus, implementation of the proposed project would have no impact relative agriculture and forestry resources.
### III. Air Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The SCAQMD construction and operational emission thresholds identified in Table 4-3 of the City of Lake Forest CEQA Significance Thresholds Guide are used for this assessment.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed qualitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodologies established by SCAQMD for assessing local impacts, including but not limited to Local Significance Thresholds and thresholds for PM2.5 are used for this assessment.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutants for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors) where the incremental effect of the project emissions, considered together with past, present, and reasonably anticipated further project emissions, increase the level of any criteria pollutant above the existing ambient level?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Analysis

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

Less than significant impact. An Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Analysis was prepared for the project in 2018 by LSA (Appendix A). The project site and all of the City of Lake Forest is located in the South Coast Air Basin. The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) and the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) are responsible for developing and implementing the South Coast Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) for the Basin. The primary purpose of an AQMP is to bring the area into compliance with federal and state air quality standards. The current plan is the 2016 AQMP.

The AQMP is based on SCAG land use assumptions, which in turn are based on City and County general plan and zoning designations. The project site is currently designated Transportation Corridor by the Lake Forest General Plan and Zoned A1 (Agriculture), and the project involves a General Plan Amendment to Public Facility and a Zone Change to CC (Community Commercial).
SCAQMD has determined that consistency with the AQMP can be demonstrated based on the two criteria outlined below:

1. **The project would not increase the frequency or severity of an air quality standards violation or cause a new violation.**

   The project would result in short-term construction and long-term pollutant emissions that would be less than the CEQA significance emissions thresholds established by SCAQMD; therefore, the project would not result in an increase in the frequency or severity of any air quality standards violation and will not cause a new air quality standard violation.

2. **The project is consistent with the growth assumptions in the AQMP.**

   The SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook indicates that consistency with AQMP growth assumptions must be analyzed for new or amended General Plan elements, Specific Plans, and significant projects. Significant projects include airports, electrical generating facilities, petroleum and gas refineries, designation of oil drilling districts, water ports, solid waste disposal sites, and offshore drilling facilities. As the proposed project is not defined as significant under this criteria, it would be consistent with the growth assumptions of the AQMP.

Based on the above analysis, the project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan, and a less than significant impact would result.

**b) Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?**

*Less than significant impact.* SCAQMD has established daily emissions thresholds for construction and operation of proposed projects in the South Coast Air Basin. The emissions outlined in Table 1 below, represent the maximum amount of construction and operational pollution that could be emitted by a proposed project and still allow the basin to maintain its attainment status for State and Federal pollution standards. Projects at or below the values outlined in Table 1 would not violate or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.

**Table 1. SCAQMD Emissions Thresholds**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pollutant</th>
<th>Construction (pounds/day)</th>
<th>Operation (pounds/day)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nitrous Oxides (NO&lt;sub&gt;x&lt;/sub&gt;)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particulate Matter &lt;10 μg (PM&lt;sub&gt;10&lt;/sub&gt;)</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particulate Matter &lt;2.5 μg (PM&lt;sub&gt;2.5&lt;/sub&gt;)</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfur Oxides (SO&lt;sub&gt;x&lt;/sub&gt;)</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon Monoxide (CO)</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead (Pb)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Analysis for the proposed Kingdom Halls project calculated pollutant emissions that would be generated by the proposed project during construction and operation. As shown on Table 2 below, the project would generate far fewer pollutant emissions than the SCAQMD thresholds and a less than significant impact would result.

Table 2. Kingdom Halls Projected Emissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pollutant</th>
<th>Construction (pounds/day)</th>
<th>Operation (pounds/day)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nitrous Oxides (NO(_X))</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particulate Matter &lt;10 (\mu g) (PM(_{10}))</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particulate Matter &lt;2.5 (\mu g) (PM(_{2.5}))</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfur Oxides (SO(_X))</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon Monoxide (CO)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead (Pb)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: LSA, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Analysis, July 2018

**c)** Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including release in emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

*Less than significant impact.* The attainment status of criteria pollutants in the South Coast Air Basin is outlined below. As shown on the table below, the basin is in non-attainment status for state and/or federal standards for ozone (1- and 8-hour), and particulate matter (PM\(_{10}\) and PM\(_{2.5}\)).

Table 3. Attainment Status of Criteria Pollutants in the South Coast Air Basin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pollutant</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Federal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O(_3) 1-hour</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O(_3) 8-hour</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>Extreme Nonattainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM(_{10})</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>Attainment/Maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM(_{2.5})</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>Serious Nonattainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
<td>Attainment/Maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO(_2)</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
<td>Unclassified/Attainment (1-hour)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO(_2)</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
<td>Unclassified/Attainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All others</td>
<td>Attainment/Unclassified</td>
<td>Attainment/Unclassified</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


CO = carbon monoxide
EPA = United States Environmental Protection Agency
N/A = not applicable
NO\(_2\) = nitrogen dioxide
O\(_3\) = ozone
PM\(_{10}\) = particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter
PM\(_{2.5}\) = particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in diameter
SCAQMD = South Coast Air Quality Management District SO\(_2\) = sulfur dioxide
The project would result in short-term construction and long-term operational pollutant emissions that are less than the SCAQMD CEQA significance emissions. The project is consistent with the growth assumptions in the AQMD and would not increase the frequency or severity of any air quality standards or cause a new violation. In addition, project emissions, when added to other proposed projects in the area, are not expected to result in cumulatively considerable increase in the frequency or severity of ozone or particulate matter air quality standards for which the region is in nonattainment. Therefore, a less than significant impact would result.

d) **Exposure to substantial pollutant concentrations?** Methodologies established by SCAQMD for assessing local impacts, including but not limited to Local Significance Thresholds and thresholds for PM$_{2.5}$ are used for this assessment.

**Less than significant impact.** Sensitive receptors are residences, schools, hospitals, and similar uses that are particularly sensitive to adverse air quality. Single- and multi-family homes surrounding the project site to the northeast, northwest, and southwest and are considered sensitive receptors in the project vicinity. Although the closest receptors are single-family residences located 33 feet from the project construction boundary, the SCAQMD Localized Significance Threshold (LST) guidance specifies that the minimum distance to be considered is 25 meters (82 feet); thus, the specified thresholds for 25 meters were used. The emissions thresholds shown in Table 4 would apply during project construction and operation.

**Table 4. Localized Significance Thresholds (LSTs) for a 1.65-Acre Site at 25 Meters**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Emissions Threshold (pounds per day)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO$_x$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**CO = carbon monoxide**  
**LST = local significance threshold**  
**NO$_x$ = nitrogen oxides**  
**PM$_{10}$ = particulate matter less than 10 microns in size**  
**PM$_{2.5}$ = particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in size**  
**SCAQMD = South Coast Air Quality Management District**

Based on the Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Analysis prepared for the project by LSA (refer to Exhibit A, Tables J, K, L and M), project construction and operational emissions would fall far below the LST values outlined above. Thus, the project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations and a less than significant impact would result.

e) **Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?**

**Less than significant impact.** During construction, heavy equipment such as bulldozers and backhoes would be utilized on-site, which could be a source of objectionable odors due to diesel exhaust. However, construction activities would be temporary, and heavy equipment would be utilized sporadically, primarily during the early phases of construction. No sources of objectionable odors would result from long-term operation of the project, and a less than significant impact would result.
f) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutants for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors) where the incremental effect of the project emissions, considered together with past, present, and reasonably anticipated further project emissions, increase the level of any criteria pollutant above the existing ambient level?

Less than significant impact. See Response No. III-c, above.
IV. Biological Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to marsh,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interruption, or other means?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>habitat conservation plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis

a) **Would the project have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?**

*No Impact.* The project site has been graded and cleared in the past and currently contains a scattered assortment of invasive shrubs and eight eucalyptus trees along the northeast property line. There are no endangered, rare, threatened, or special status plan or wildlife species designated by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), or California Native Plant Society (CNPS) on the project site. Thus, project implementation would not adversely affect any sensitive plant or animal species, and no impact would occur.

b) **Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?**

*No Impact.* There is no riparian habitat on or adjacent to the project site, and implementation of the project would not adversely affect any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural biological community. No impact would occur.
c) Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

**No Impact.** There are no federally protected wetlands on or adjacent to the project site. Therefore, grading, construction, and implementation of the proposed project would not affect protected wetland areas.

d) Would the project interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

**No Impact.** The project site consists of a predominantly vacant, disturbed, and graded parcel of land located in an urbanized area surrounded by development. The site does not connect areas of habitat and would not interfere with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species. Furthermore, the limited amount of vegetation on the site, including trees, limits the attractiveness of the site to native species. No impact would occur.

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

**No Impact.** Chapter 6.20 of the Lake Forest Municipal Code contains regulations pertaining to the conversion, maintenance, and removal of eucalyptus trees in the City. Eucalyptus trees in the City of Lake Forest are endangered by the presence of a beetle identified as the eucalyptus longhorn borer. These beetles lay their eggs on the eucalyptus trees, and the larvae bore holes within the trees, causing serious damage and destruction. The control of infestation by this beetle can be helped by regulating the maintenance of such trees in a healthy and nonhazardous condition through good arboricultural practices. The City’s local ordinance prohibits the transportation and cutting of eucalyptus trees or logs during the beetle’s breeding period, between April 1 and October 31, without a City permit. The City permit ensures that the removal of eucalyptus trees is done properly, to ensure that any beetles in a tree do not spread to other trees. There are nine mature eucalyptus trees along the northeastern site boundary on the project site and several mature eucalyptus trees immediately adjacent to the site on the northwest and southeast. The project would remove the eight on-site eucalyptus trees to install a 6-foot-high solid concrete wall on the northeastern site boundary, does not include the removal of any of the eucalyptus trees. However, in accordance with the City’s ordinance, if any of the eucalyptus trees were proposed to be removed between April 1 and October 31, a Eucalyptus Tree Cutting permit would be required by the City. Thus, no impact would occur.

f) Would the project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

**No Impact.** The 1996 County of Orange Central and Coastal Subregion Natural Community Conservation Plan and Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP/NCCP) is in effect for the City of Lake Forest and several surrounding jurisdictions. However, the project site is not located within the HCP/NCCP and implementation of the proposed project would not affect any sensitive species or habitats identified in the plan. Thus, no impact would occur.
V. Cultural Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis

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

*Less than significant impact.* A Cultural Resources records search performed for the project site (Appendix B) identified one cultural resource in the vicinity of the site. P-30-176663 consists of an approximately 14.7-mile segment of the Burlington Northern Santa Fe (formerly Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe) Railway dating back to the 1880s. A portion of this railway was located immediately west/southwest of the project site in approximately the same location as the modern railway. In addition, the project site likely contained the historic El Toro train depot, consisting of a small wood-framed structure serving as a depot for the adjacent rail line. However, the railroad tracks and the train depot were demolished decades ago, possibly in the late 1960s in conjunction with demolition of part of El Toro Road prior to construction of the roadway overpass and current railroad. No remnants of the historic railway or train depot were found to exist on the project site, and the cultural resources site does not appear eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (Sprindrift, 2018). Thus, the project would have a less than significant impact on historical resources.

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

*Less than significant with mitigation.* A records search and field survey conducted for the project site found no record of any archaeological resources on the project site. In addition, the project site is underlain by Quaternary non marine terrace deposits and is outside the 0.2% annual chance floodplain, two factors that indicate a low probability for subsurface cultural resources. In addition, based upon a Geotechnical Engineering Report prepared by Terracon (Appendix G), the project site is overlain by approximately seven feet of fill, likely as a result of construction of the railway and El Toro Road, which also has a low potential for cultural resources. Nonetheless, in the unlikely event that archaeological resources are encountered during grading activities on the project site, Mitigation Measure CULT-1 would ensure that impacts to cultural resources would be less than significant.

*Mitigation Measure*

CULT-1 If subsurface deposits believed to be cultural or human in origin are discovered during construction, all work must halt within a 50-foot radius of the discovery. An archaeological monitor or a Principal Investigator, meeting the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualification Standards for prehistoric and historic archaeology, shall be afforded a reasonable amount of time to evaluate the significance of the find. Work cannot continue.
at the discovery site until the archaeologist conducts sufficient research and data collection to make a determination that the resource is either 1) not cultural in origin; or 2) not potentially significant or eligible for listing on the NRHP or CRHR. If a potentially eligible resource is encountered, the archaeologist, the lead agency, and the project proponent shall arrange for either 1) total avoidance of the resource, if possible; or 2) test excavations to evaluate eligibility and, if eligible, total data recovery as mitigation. The determination shall be formally documented in writing and submitted to the lead agency as verification that the provisions in CEQA/National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) for managing unanticipated discoveries have been met. In the event that evidence of human remains is discovered, construction activities within 50 feet of the discovery will be halted or diverted, and the requirements above will be implemented. Depending on the occurrence, a larger radius may be necessary and will be required at the discretion of the on-site archaeologist. In addition, the provisions of §7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code, §5097.98 of the California Public Resources Code, and Assembly Bill 2641 will be implemented. When human remains are discovered, state law requires that the discovery be reported to the County Coroner (§7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code) and that reasonable protection measures be taken during construction to protect the discovery from disturbance (AB 2641). If the Coroner determines the remains are Native American, the Coroner notifies the NAHC, which then designates a Native American MLD for the project (§5097.98 of the California Public Resources Code). The MLD may not be the same person as the tribal monitor. The designated MLD then has 48 hours from the time access to the property is granted to make recommendations concerning treatment of the remains (AB 2641). If the landowner does not agree with the recommendations of the MLD, the NAHC can mediate (§5097.94 of the California Public Resources Code). If no agreement is reached, the landowner must rebury the remains where they will not be further disturbed (§5097.98 of the California Public Resources Code). This will also include either recording the site with the NAHC or the appropriate Information Center; using an open space or conservation zoning designation or easement; or recording a document with the county in which the property is located (AB 2641). Prior to issuance of any building permits, the applicant shall provide the City with either the required documentation from the archaeologist, as described in this mitigation measure, or a signed written statement from the contractor performing the grading activities, stating that no subsurface deposits, believed to be cultural or human origin, were discovered during grading activities.

c) **Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature?**

**Less than significant with mitigation.** A Paleontological Records Search conducted for the project site identified four recorded fossil localities just over 1 mile from the project site (Appendix B). The fossils included fossilized impressions or remains of plants, marine invertebrates and marine, aquatic and terrestrial vertebrates. The project site and vicinity are underlain by two geologic rock units that are known to have a high potential for fossilized remains. However, the project site is overlain by approximately seven feet of undocumented fill which has a very low potential for paleontological resources. Rough grading would penetrate approximately 3 feet into the fill and remedial geotechnical work would be conducted in around the buildings and other areas. As native soils would be only minimally impacted by the proposed project, there is a low likelihood of discovering paleontological resources during construction. Nonetheless, in the event that subsurface
paleontological resources on the site are encountered during earthwork activities, Mitigation Measure CULT-2 would reduce potential impacts to less than significant.

**Mitigation Measure**

CULT-2 If subsurface paleontological resources (i.e. fossil remains) are discovered during construction, all work must halt within a 50-foot radius of the discovery and the City of Lake Forest shall be notified. The project applicant shall retain a City-approved paleontologist to assess the significance of the find. Impacts to any significant resources shall be mitigated to a less-than-significant level through methods determined adequate by the paleontologist and approved by the City. Prior to issuance of any building permits, the applicant shall provide the City with either a report of findings with an appended itemized inventory of specimens, or a signed written statement from the contractor performing the grading activities, stating that no paleontological resources were discovered during grading activities.

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

*Less than significant with mitigation.* A records search and field survey conducted for the project site found no record of human remains on the project site. In addition, the project site is underlain by Quaternary non-marine terrace deposits, is outside the 0.2% annual chance floodplain, and is overlain by fill materials, factors that indicate a low probability for subsurface human remains. Nonetheless, in the unlikely event that human remains are encountered during grading activities on the project site, Mitigation Measure CULT-1 will require notification of the County Coroner to determine the appropriate treatment and disposition of the remains and involvement of a Native American MLD as required by state law. With the incorporation of Mitigation Measure CULT-1, impacts to human remains would be less than significant.
VI. Geology and Soils

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of known fault?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Landslides?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (2001), creating substantial risks to life or property?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis

a) Would the project expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

i) **Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of known fault?**

   *Less than significant impact.* Refer to ii), below.

   **Strong seismic ground shaking?**

   *Less than significant impact.* A 2017 geotechnical report prepared by Terracon documented geotechnical conditions on the project site, including seismic hazards (Appendix G). Southern California is an active seismic region, and moderate to strong earthquakes can occur on numerous faults. However, the project site is not located within a currently-designated Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Zone, and no known active faults are mapped on the project site. The closest fault to the site is the San Joaquin Hills Fault located 4.6 kilometers from the site, and the property will likely be shaken by future earthquakes produced on this or other local or regional faults. However, secondary effects, such as surface rupture, are not considered likely. In addition, the project will be conditioned to incorporate measures to stabilize the proposed structures and reduce the effect of seismic shaking. As such, the exposure of people to strong ground shaking or fault rupture will be minimized, and impacts would be less than significant.
iii) **Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?**

**No impact.** Seismic-related ground failure refers to landslides, surface fault rupture, and liquefaction caused by earthquake activity. Liquefaction is a type of ground failure that typically occurs where loose sandy soils exist below groundwater. The project site is located in a seismically active area and will likely be subject to seismic shaking in the future. However, according to the project geotechnical report, seismic-related ground failure including liquefaction on the project site is unlikely. In addition, the California Geologic Survey (CGS) has designated certain areas as potential liquefaction hazard zones. These are areas considered at a risk of liquefaction-related ground failure during a seismic event, based upon mapped surficial deposits and the presence of a relatively shallow water table. The project site is not located in a liquefaction hazard zone as designated by the CGS. In addition, the type of soil present on the project site is considered to have a low potential for liquefaction. Thus, no impact would result.

iv) **Landslides?**

**No impact.** The project site is relatively level, ranging in elevation from approximately 438 feet above mean sea level (AMSL) at the northeast corner of the site to 434 feet AMSL at the southwest corner of the site where it begins to slope down to the railroad right of way. As a basically flat site, it has a low potential for landslides. In addition, the project site and vicinity has not been subject to landslides or other seismically induced ground deformation. Therefore, the project would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects associated with landslides.

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

**No Impact.** The project site has been graded in the past and contains undocumented fill material near the surface of the site consisting of clayey sand and sandy lean clay. Construction of the project will require grading of up to 3 feet of cut and 6 feet of fill and compaction of on-site soils. All areas of the site will be developed, paved, or landscaped, which will stabilize the soils. In addition, the relatively flat nature of the site and the implementation of a water quality management plan will further reduce the potential for soil erosion. No impact would result.

c) **Would the project be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?**

**No impact.** The project site is not located in an unstable geologic unit, and, as outlined above, would not create the potential for landslide, spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse. No impact would result.

d) **Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (2001), creating substantial risks to life or property?**

**Less than significant with mitigation.** As previously identified, the project site is relatively level and includes undocumented fill material including clayey sand and sandy lean clay that does not appear to be well compacted. The geotechnical report recommends that all fill materials on the site be engineered and compacted and that non-clayey soils be imported for use beneath the buildings together with lateral spread footings, as outlined in Mitigation Measure GEO-1, below. Implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-1 would reduce potential risks associated with the expansive soils to less than significant.
Mitigation Measure

GEO-1 The project grading and building plans submitted to the City shall include notes and/or drawings demonstrating conformance with the following: All fill materials within the footprint of the proposed buildings shall be removed, excavated, and thoroughly cleaned prior to backfill placement and/or construction. After removal of undocumented fill within the proposed building footprints, foundations and floor slab areas should be supported on engineered fill. The proposed buildings may be supported by shallow spread footings bearing on engineered fill extending to a minimum depth of 2 feet below the bottom of the footings or to the bottom of the undocumented fill encountered during construction, whichever is greater. The bottom of the overexcavation should be scarified, moisture conditions and compacted to the requirement in Section 4.2.4 of the Geotechnical Engineering Report prepared by Terracon and dated November 22, 2017. Due to the expansive nature of the clayey soils, the upper 18 inches of engineered fill placed beneath floor slabs should comprise low volume change import materials. Any deviation to the recommendations in the Geotechnical Report should be reviewed and approved by the Engineer of Record and the City prior to implementation.

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

No Impact. The project would connect to municipal sewer lines and would not include septic tanks or other alternative waste water disposal systems. No impact would result.
VII. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis

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

*Less than significant impact.* Refer to b), below.

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

*Less than significant impact.*

Greenhouse gases (GHGs) are naturally present in the atmosphere, and are released by natural sources or formed from secondary reactions taking place in the atmosphere. In addition, human activities over the past 200 years have caused greatly increased quantities of GHGs to be released into the atmosphere, which in turn increases the natural greenhouse effect and are thought to cause global warming. Human-induced GHGs include the following:

- Carbon dioxide (CO₂)
- Methane (CH₄)
- Nitrous oxide (N₂O)
- Hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs)
- Perfluorocarbons (PFCs)
- Sulfur hexafluoride (SF₆)

According to an Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Analysis prepared by LSA (Appendix A), the California Air Resources Board (ARB) estimates that transportation sources make up 37% of the state’s GHG emissions, followed by industrial sources (21%), electricity generation (19%), residential and commercial activities (9%), agriculture (8%), and other sources (6%).

To provide guidance to local lead agencies on determining significance for GHG emissions in their CEQA documents, SCAQMD proposed an analysis methodology using a four-tiered approach for the evaluation of GHG emissions for development projects where SCAQMD is not the lead agency (SCAQMD 2010). Tier 1 refers to projects that are exempt from CEQA; Tier 2 refers to projects that are subject to a GHG reduction plan; Tier 3 refers to projects that would generate less than 3,000 MT CO₂e per year; and Tier 4 refers to very large projects. As the project does not qualify for Tiers 1, 2 or 4, Tier 3 is the appropriate Tier for the proposed project.

The project would generate GHG emissions during construction and operation. Sources of project emissions would include construction vehicle exhaust; gas, electricity and water use; solid waste disposal; and vehicular emissions. LSA calculated the GHG emissions expected to result from construction and operation of the project, as outlined in Table 5 below.
### Table 5. Construction and Operational Greenhouse Gas Emissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Bio-CO₂</th>
<th>NBio-CO₂</th>
<th>Total CO₂</th>
<th>CH₄</th>
<th>N₂O</th>
<th>CO₂e</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction emissions amortized over 30 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operational Emissions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Sources</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Sources</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Sources</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Sources</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Usage</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Project Emissions</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SCAQMD Threshold 3,000

| Significant? | No |

Source: Compiled by LSA (February 2018)

Notes:
- Numbers in table may not appear to total correctly due to rounding of all numbers to two significant digits.
- Bio-CO₂ = biologically generated CO₂
- NBio-CO₂ = non-biologically generated CO₂
- CO₂ = carbon dioxide
- CH₄ = methane
- N₂O = nitrous oxide
- CO₂e = carbon dioxide equivalent

As outlined in Table 5 above, the project is projected to generate 183 MT CO₂e of GHG emissions per year. Because project-related GHG emissions would be substantially below the SCAQMD threshold of 3,000 MT CO₂e per year, project-related GHG impacts would be less than significant, and the project would not conflict with applicable GHG plans, policies or regulations.
### VIII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis**

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

*Less than significant impact.* Refer to b), below.

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

*Less than significant impact.* The proposed construction and operation of two Kingdom Hall religious facilities would not involve the routine transport, use, or disposal of significant hazardous materials. Project construction and operational activities may involve the use of small amounts of solvents, cleaners, paint, oils/fuel, and pesticides/herbicides. However, use of these common hazardous materials in small quantities would not represent a significant hazard to the public or the environment. In addition, the transportation, use, and disposal of these materials would be required to adhere to state and local standards and regulations for handling, storage, and disposal of hazardous substances. Compliance with applicable regulations will minimize potential health risks associated with their use or the accidental release of such substances. Accordingly, the proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. A less than significant impact would occur.
c) **Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?**

**No impact.** There are four existing private schools and no existing or proposed public schools located within a quarter mile of the project site. Abiding Savior Lutheran School and Arbor Christian School are located approximately 0.1 mile southwest of the site, and Heritage Christian School and the Oxford Preparatory Academy located approximately 0.25 mile northwest of the site. However, other than the use of small amounts of substances such as solvents and pesticides, the project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, and no impact would result to existing or proposed schools.

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

**Less than significant with mitigation.** A Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) was conducted for the project site by Terracon in October 2017 (Appendix C). The ESA included a search of state and federal hazardous materials databases. The site is not on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code §65962.5. However, the Phase 1 ESA also included a site survey and reconnaissance by qualified environmental investigators. The reconnaissance identified approximately 150 cubic yards of dumped fill dirt located in piles at the southeastern quadrant of the site. Project sponsors are unaware of the circumstances surrounding the material.

To determine whether the fill dirt stockpiles contain hazardous materials or substances, Terracon completed a Report of Waste Characterization report, dated January 2, 2018. Laboratory analytical results for the soil samples collected from the on-site stockpile indicated the presence of relatively small concentrations of petroleum hydrocarbons, metals, and other substances. According to Terracon, the materials are considered suitable for use as fill material under the asphalt parking lot if geotechnical analysis determines that the material can be properly engineered.

In addition to the stockpiles of fill material outlined above, undocumented fill materials are present throughout the remainder of the site, likely as a result of former construction of the railway and El Toro Road. The Phase 1 ESA and Geotechnical Reports prepared by Terracon indicate these materials are likely safe and suitable for use in the proposed project if they are engineered appropriately and not placed directly beneath the proposed buildings. However, as the exact composition of the soils are not known, care should be taken during grading and earthwork operations to ensure that construction workers are not exposed to potentially contaminated soils. Mitigation Measure HAZ-1 will ensure proper handling of fill materials and would mitigate any potential hazard to the environment or public.

**Mitigation Measure**

**HAZ-1** Prior to issuance of a grading permit for the proposed project, a Construction Contingency Plan shall be developed by a qualified environmental professional in consultation with the City Engineer. At a minimum, the Construction Contingency Plan shall include guidance for handling, segregating, and characterizing potentially contaminated soil generated during grading activities to minimize impacts to worker safety and the environment. The Plan shall also identify that the Contractor must verify that all exported soils are not contaminated with hazardous materials above regulatory thresholds in consultation with a Phase II/Site Characterization Specialist. If export soils are determined to be contaminated...
above regulatory thresholds, the Phase II/Site Characterization Specialist shall recommend proper handling, use, and/or disposal of these soils.

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

No impact. The project site is located approximately 11 miles southeast of John Wayne Airport, the closest airport to the site. The site is not located within the John Wayne Airport Land Use Plan and would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

f) **For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?**

No impact. The project site is not located near a private airstrip and would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

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

No impact. The Orange County Fire Authority (OCFA) and the Orange County Sheriff’s Department (OCSD) are responsible for coordinating emergency operations in the event of a disaster. In addition, the City of Lake Forest Director of Public Works is responsible for cooperating with OCFA, OCSD, and other agencies on roadway operations to maximize traffic safety. During construction and operation, the proposed project would result in a slight increase in cars and trucks accessing El Toro Road. However, these trips are not expected to impact traffic operations, and the project would not impair implementation of emergency response operations along this corridor.

h) **Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?**

No Impact. The project site is located in an urbanized area and is surrounded by development. The site is not located in or near a wildland area and is not located in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone as identified and recommended by CAL FIRE. Thus, the project would not expose people or structures to significant risks from wildland fires, and no impact would result.
### IX. Hydrology and Water Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surface Water and Flooding</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff above pre-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development condition in a manner which would result in flooding on-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or off-site?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>existing or planned stormwater drainage systems?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>delineation map?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>redirect flood flows?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or dam?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Cause inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Deposit sediment and debris materials within existing channels obstructing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flows?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Exceed the capacity of a channel and cause overflow during design storm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conditions?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Groundwater</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) Adversely change the rate, direction or flow of groundwater?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k) Have an impact on groundwater that is inconsistent with a groundwater</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>management plan prepared by the water agencies with the responsibility for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>groundwater management?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water Quality</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m) Cause a significant alteration of receiving water quality during or following</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>construction?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n) Substantially degrade groundwater quality?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p) Create or contribute runoff water which would generate substantial additional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sources of polluted runoff?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q) Substantially degrade water quality by discharge which affects the beneficial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uses (i.e., swimming, fishing, etc.) of the receiving or downstream waters?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r) Increase in any pollutant for which the receiving water body is already</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impaired as listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis

Surface Water and Flooding

a) Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff above pre-development condition in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?

Less than significant impact. Refer to b), below.

b) Would the project create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems?

Less than significant impact. The project site is relatively level, ranging in elevation from approximately 438 feet above mean sea level (AMSL) at the northeast corner of the site to 434 feet AMSL at the southwest corner of the site where it begins to slope down to the railroad right of way. The site is not located on or near any mapped streams, rivers, or other water courses. According to a Hydrology Report prepared for the project by HEITEC (Appendix F), runoff from the site drains southwesterly towards the railroad right of way. In addition, drainage from El Toro Road and the existing Kingdom Hall facility enters the site along the southeasterly boundary and also flows toward the railroad right of way.

The project design includes a V-ditch along the southeastern site boundary to intercept and direct existing runoff from El Toro Road and the existing Kingdom Hall site into a new rock apron to reduce the velocity of the drainage before discharging into the railroad right of way as in the pre-development condition. Incorporation of the V-ditch will prevent the comingling of off-site and on-site run-off.

Runoff from the project site will drain toward a Dry Extended Detention Basin (DEDB) at the southern corner of the site. Runoff from the site will sheet flow across paving and drain into landscape islands and then be routed to the DEDB by vegetative channels. Drainage from the roof will flow to roof drains and then also be routed to the DEDB. The DEDB will contain flows from the site, reduce the velocity of runoff entering the drainage system, and allow pollutants to settle out before drainage leaves the site. The DEDB will include an underdrain, composed of a perforated pipe buried in a porous media, such as gravel or sand. The underdrain will drain on the south side of the DEDB to the railroad right of way at the same volume and velocity of runoff in the pre-development condition and would not exceed the capacity of the existing downstream stormwater drainage system. Thus, the project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area or increase the rate or amount of surface runoff, and a less than significant impact would result.

c) Would the project place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?

No impact. The project site is located in an “Area of Minimal Flood Hazard” according to the Federal Emergency Management Agency’s (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) and is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area. In addition, the project proposes the development of two Kingdom Hall buildings and does not include housing. Thus, the project would not place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area, and no impact would result.
d) **Would the project place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?**

*No impact.* As outlined in c) above, the project site is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area. Thus, the project would not place structures within a 100-year flood hazard area and would not impede or redirect flood flows, and no impact would result.

e) **Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?**

*No impact.* The project site is not located in a flood hazard area, and there are no dams or levees on or near the project site. Thus, the project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including as a result of levee or dam failure. No impact would result.

f) **Would the project cause inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?**

*No impact.* The project site is not located on or near the ocean or other water body that could be associated with a risk of seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. Thus, the project would not cause inundation by these hazards, and no impact would result.

g) **Would the project deposit sediment and debris materials within existing channels obstructing flows?**

*Less than significant impact.* There are no existing drainage channels on the project site. As outlined above, runoff from the project site flows to the railroad right of way in a southwesterly direction. During construction, earthwork activities such as grading and trenching have the potential to generate sediment and debris that could be transported downstream by runoff leaving the site. However, the project would comply with Chapters 8.30 and 15.14 of the Municipal Code, which require the incorporation of best management practices (BMPs) to minimize downstream erosion and sedimentation.

During long-term operation of the project, runoff would be directed to a DEDB that would collect sediment and debris before discharging runoff from the site to an existing drainage course along the railroad right of way at pre-development rates. Thus, the project would not deposit sediment and debris within existing channels or obstruct flows, and a less than significant impact would result.

h) **Would the project exceed the capacity of a channel and cause overflow during design storm conditions?**

*Less than significant impact.* According to a Conceptual Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) prepared by HEITEC (Appendix H), during storm conditions, runoff from the site would continue to flow to the DEDB. If the storm water runoff exceeds the capacity of the DEDB, excess storm water would discharge across the top of the DEDB along the south side of the basin as in pre-development conditions and would not cause downstream drainage facilities to exceed their capacity. A less than significant impact would result.
Groundwater

i) Would the project substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

Less than significant impact. Refer to j), below.

j) Would the project adversely change the rate, direction or flow of groundwater?

Less than significant impact. Geotechnical borings conducted by Terracon did not encounter any groundwater on-site (Appendix G). Based on well logs in the area, Terracon estimates that groundwater is approximately 25 to 45 feet below the surface elevation of the site. The project would obtain water from the Irvine Ranch Water District (IRWD) and would not involve the direct withdrawal of groundwater for project construction or operation. However, over 50% of IRWD’s domestic water supplies come from groundwater from the Orange County Groundwater basin and the Irvine and Lake Forest Sub-basins. The project is expected to generate a demand for 6,240 gallons of water per week. IRWD has indicated it has an adequate supply of domestic water to serve the site and the project is not projected to substantially deplete groundwater supplies.

Regarding groundwater recharge, while the project includes 69,118 square feet of impervious areas, which could restrict the percolation of water into the groundwater basin, it also includes landscaped areas and a DEDB, which would serve to increase water infiltration and potentially contribute to groundwater supplies. Thus, the project would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge. In addition, the project would not change the rate, direction or flow of groundwater, and a less than significant impact would result.

k) Would the project have an impact on groundwater that is inconsistent with a groundwater management plan prepared by the water agencies with the responsibility for groundwater management?

No impact. The project site is not located within a groundwater management plan prepared by a water agency responsible for groundwater management. No impact would result.

Water Quality

l) Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?

Less than significant impact. Storm water quality is regulated at the national, state, regional and local levels. At the national level, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has established regulations under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) to preserve, protect, enhance, and restore water quality. In California, the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) is responsible for administering the NPDES permitting program and developing NPDES permitting requirements. The SWRCB works with nine Regional Water Quality Control Boards (RWQCB) to further administer NPDES permitting at the regional level. Two RWQCBs have jurisdiction in the City of Lake Forest: the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) and the San Diego RWQCB. The project site is located under the jurisdiction of the Santa Ana RWQCB.

The City of Lake Forest has established regulations and requirements to further implement the requirements of the NPDES system. Chapter 15.14 of the Lake Forest Municipal Code contains regulations related to storm water management. Construction activities would be required to comply...
with the water quality regulations of the City. These regulations require the contractor to utilize best management practices to prevent the discharge of pollutants from the site, which could cause the area to violate water quality standards. In addition, the project has been required to prepare a WQMP to address how water quality will be maintained during long term operation of the project.

Based on the WQMP, expected pollutants of concern would include suspended solids and sediment; oil and grease from vehicles; and trash and debris. Project construction and operation will include best management practices to reduce the amount of solids and sediments in project runoff, and the DEDB will filter out sediments before discharging drainage from the site. Likewise, the DEDB will filter any oil and grease entering the system. Site maintenance and regular waste disposal will minimize trash and debris entering the storm water system. Thus, the project would not violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, and a less than significant impact would result.

m) Would the project cause a significant alteration of receiving water quality during or following construction?

Less than significant impact. The WQMP prepared for the project indicates that Aliso Creek receives runoff from the project site and vicinity. As previously identified, measures have been incorporated into the project to ensure that drainage from the site will match pre-development velocities and volumes. In addition, the site design, BMPs, and incorporation of the DEDB will prevent pollutants from entering the drainage system. Thus, the project would not significantly alter receiving waters during or following construction, and a less than significant impact would result.

n) Would the project substantially degrade groundwater quality?

Less than significant impact. As previously identified, the project site is not in a groundwater management plan, and groundwater is estimated to be located 25 to 45 feet beneath the surface of the site. Runoff from the site will be collected in landscaped areas and an on-site DEDB, which would serve to filter any oil, gas or other pollution contained in surface runoff. Thus, any water that percolates to the groundwater system is not anticipated to contain pollutants, and the project would not substantially degrade groundwater quality. A less than significant impact would result.

o) Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

Less than significant impact. As previously identified, the project would contain runoff from the site in a DEDB, which would then release drainage into the natural drainage course along the railroad right of way at pre-development velocities and volumes. In addition, drainage from El Toro Road and the existing Kingdom Hall site would be diverted to a V-ditch and also directed to the railroad right of way, as in the current condition. Thus, the project would not alter the overall drainage pattern of the area or result in substantial erosion or siltation on-or off-site. A less than significant impact would result.

p) Would the project create or contribute runoff water which would generate substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

Less than significant impact. Refer to q), below.
q) Substantially degrade water quality by discharge which affects the beneficial uses (i.e. swimming, fishing, etc.) of the receiving or downstream waters?

Less than significant impact. As outlined above, the on-site DEDB would collect and discharge runoff from the site at pre-development velocities and volumes. In addition, project landscaping and the DEDB would serve to filter pollutants from the runoff water before discharging to off-site drainage channels. Thus, the project would not degrade water quality or affect beneficial uses, and a less than significant impact would result.

r) Would the project increase in any pollutant for which the receiving water body is already impaired as listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list?

Less than significant impact. Runoff from the project site eventually flows into Aliso Creek. According to the WQMP prepared for the project, Aliso Creek is impaired for benthic community effects, indicator bacteria, Malathion, nitrogen, phosphorus, selenium, and toxicity. The project is not anticipated to generate significant amounts of any of these pollutants, and the project includes landscaped areas and a DEDB, which would filter runoff before it enters the drainage basin. Thus, the project would not increase any pollutants for which the receiving water body is impaired and a less than significant impact would result.


X. Land Use and Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Physically divide an established community?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially conflict with existing on-site or adjacent land use due to project-related significant unavoidable indirect effects (e.g., noise, aesthetics, etc.) that preclude use of the land as it was intended by the General Plan?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, planned community, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Conflict with the Central and Coastal Natural Communities Conservation Program/Habitat Conservation Plan (NCC/HCP) of which the City of Lake Forest is a participant?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis

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

*No impact.* The vacant project site is located in an urbanized area and is somewhat isolated and screened from view by surrounding development and an elevated portion of El Toro Road. The proposed project would take access off El Toro Road via an existing Kingdom Hall driveway and parking lot and would provide adequate on-site parking for the intended uses. The project would not modify or preclude access in or around the surrounding area and would not divide an established community. No impact would result.

b) **Would the project substantially conflict with existing on-site or adjacent land use due to project-related significant unavoidable indirect effects (e.g., noise, aesthetics, etc.) that preclude use of the land as it was intended by the General Plan?**

*No impact.* Land uses surrounding the project site include single-family residential development to the northwest/northeast; multi-family residential development, a parking lot and religious facility to the east/southeast; El Toro Road to the south/southeast; and the railroad right-of-way and residential development to the west/southwest. The two proposed Kingdom Hall buildings would be located on the southeastern half of the site away from adjacent residential land uses. As identified elsewhere in this report, development of the proposed project would not result in significant noise, aesthetic, or other unavoidable impacts that could adversely affect adjacent uses. No impact would result.

c) **Would the project conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, planned community, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?**

*Less than significant impact.* The project site is currently designated Transportation Corridor by the City of Lake Forest General Plan. The Transportation Corridor designation applies to land along major transportation corridors in the City. Land uses allowed within the Transportation Corridor designation are intended to be transportation-related, although secondary uses such as parking, landscaping and open space linkages are allowed as well. The 2.59-acre project site is designated Transportation Corridor owing to its location adjacent to the railroad right-of-way.
However, the site is not needed for railroad operations, and a General Plan Amendment is proposed to change the land use designation of the site to Public Facility. The proposed project is consistent with the Public Facility designation, which is intended for a wide range of public and semi-public uses such as schools, public utilities, libraries, and religious facilities. In addition, the existing Southern California Gas facility is consistent with this designation. Therefore, a less than significant impact would result.

**Zoning Ordinance**

**Less than significant impact.** The project site is currently zoned A1 – General Agriculture by the Lake Forest Zoning Ordinance. The intent of the A1 zone at this location is as an interim zone until a more appropriate zone can be identified for the site. As outlined in the Lake Forest Municipal Code, Section 9.72.011, this zone “may be used as an interim zone in those areas which the General Plan may designate for more intensive urban uses in the future.” A rezone to CC - Community Commercial is proposed to accommodate the proposed religious uses. As outlined in Section 9.72.040 of the Lake Forest Municipal Code, the purpose of the CC zone is “to provide for the development and maintenance of high-intensity commercial uses which serve the local community and are compatible with surrounding residential uses.” Churches are permitted in the CC zone with a Site Development Permit.

The project would conform with all applicable regulations of the CC Zone, including regulations related to height, floor area ratio, and parking, and a less than significant impact would result.

**El Toro Design Guidelines**

**No impact.** The El Toro Design Guidelines provide site design, architecture, landscape, and signage guidelines for new development within the City’s former redevelopment project area, including the project site. The purpose of the Guidelines is to establish a desirable image, identity, and character along El Toro Road. As previously identified, the project site is not readily visible from El Toro Road due to the elevated nature of the road adjacent to the project site and the intervening trees. Nonetheless, the project is consistent with the guidelines in the following ways: 1) the proposed use is compatible with the surrounding area; 2) buildings and parking area are designed in a way to minimizes impacts on the surrounding neighborhood; 3) the architectural design of the two structures, though modest, provides some visual variation through awnings, color, ledger stone, parapet wall height variations, and shadow effects (awnings and landscape); 4) the landscape plan is designed to visually soften views of the site from El Toro Road and provides 44% of the site in landscaping. Thus, the project would not conflict with the El Toro Design Guidelines and no impact would result.

d) **Would the project conflict the Central and Coastal Natural Communities Conservation Program/Habitat Conservation Plan (NCCP/HCP) of which the City of Lake Forest is a participant?**

**No Impact.** The City of Lake Forest is a participant in the Orange County Central and Coastal Natural Communities Conservation Program/Habitat Conservation Plan (NCCP/HCP). The purpose of the NCCP/HCP is to protect and manage sensitive biologic habitats and species within a 208,000-acre area of central Orange County. Although the project site is located within the planning area of the NCCP/HCP, the project site is not located within the reserve system of the plan. The project site is in an area identified as urbanized and is located in an area designated for development. In addition, the project site is vacant and does not contain important habitat or species. Thus, the project would be consistent with the NCCP/HCP, and no impact would result.
XI. Mineral Resources

Would the project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation | Less than Significant Impact | No Impact
--- | --- | --- | --- | ---
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local Comprehensive Plan, specific plan or other land use plan? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐

Analysis

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

*Less than significant impact.* Refer to b), below.

b) *Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local Comprehensive Plan, specific plan or other land use plan?*

*Less than significant impact.* According to the State of California, Department of Conservation, the project site and vicinity is located in Mineral Resource Zone 3 (MRZ-3), which indicates that mineral deposits may be present but are of unknown significance. The City’s General Plan previously identified sand and gravel resources elsewhere in the City as the only significant mineral resources in the City; however, those have since been extracted and are no longer considered a resource. No sand and gravel resources are known to exist on the project site, and thus project impacts on mineral resources would be less than significant.
## XII. Noise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| a) A proposed project would normally have a significant offsite traffic noise impact if both of the following criteria are met:  
1) Project traffic will cause a noise level increase of 3 dB or more on a roadway segment adjacent to a noise sensitive land use. Noise sensitive land uses include the following: residential (single-family, multi-family, mobile home); hotels; motels; nursing homes; hospitals; parks; playgrounds and recreation areas; and schools.  
2) The resulting “future with project” noise level exceeds the noise standard for sensitive uses as identified in the City of Lake Forest General Plan (refer to the City’s Interior and Exterior Noise Standards). | | X | | |
| b) Exceed the stationary source noise criteria for the City of Lake Forest as specified by the Exterior noise standards set forth in the Noise Control chapter of the Lake Forest Municipal Code. | | X | | |
| c) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? | | | X | |
| d) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? | | | X | |
| e) Expose persons to, or generate, excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? | | | X | |

### Analysis

a) A proposed project would normally have a significant offsite traffic noise impact if both of the following criteria are met:

1) Project traffic will cause a noise level increase of 3 dB or more on a roadway segment adjacent to a noise sensitive land use. Noise sensitive land uses include the following: residential (single-family, multi-family, mobile home); hotels; motels; nursing homes; hospitals; parks; playgrounds and recreation areas; and schools.

Less than significant impact. Refer to 2), below.

2) The resulting “future with project” noise level exceeds the noise standard for sensitive uses as identified in the City of Lake Forest General Plan (refer to the City’s Interior and Exterior Noise Standards).

Less than significant impact. The City of Lake Forest General Plan Safety and Noise Element contains goals and policies to minimize the effect of noise on the community. The Element includes interior and exterior noise standards for residential, commercial, industrial land uses, as well as schools, parks, playgrounds and recreational uses (Table 6).
Table 6. Lake Forest General Plan Noise Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Noise Standards1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interior2,3</td>
<td>Exterior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential – Single family, multifamily, duplex, mobile home</td>
<td>CNEL 45 dB</td>
<td>CNEL 65 dB4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential – Transient lodging, hotels, motels, nursing homes, hospitals</td>
<td>CNEL 45 dB</td>
<td>CNEL 65 dB4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private offices, church sanctuaries, libraries, board rooms, conference rooms, theaters, auditoriums, concert halls, meeting halls, etc.</td>
<td>(L_{eq}(12)) 45 dBA(^{2,6})</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>(L_{eq}(12)) 45 dBA</td>
<td>(L_{eq}(12))67 dBA5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General offices, reception, clerical, etc.</td>
<td>(L_{eq}(12)) 50 dBA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank lobby, retail store, restaurant, typing pool, etc.</td>
<td>(L_{eq}(12)) 55 dBA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing, kitchen, warehousing, etc.</td>
<td>(L_{eq}(12)) 65 dBA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks, playgrounds</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>CNEL 65 dB5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf courses, outdoor spectator sports, amusement parks</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>CNEL 70 dB6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1 CNEL = Community Noise Equivalent Level. \(L_{eq}(12)\) = the A-weighted equivalent sound level averaged over a 12-hour period (usually the hours of operation).
2 Noise standard with windows closed. Mechanical ventilation shall be provided per UBC requirements to provide a habitable environment.
3 Indoor environment excluding bathrooms, toilets, closets, and corridors.
4 Outdoor environment limited to rear yard of single-family homes, multifamily patios and balconies (with a depth of 6 feet or more) and common recreation areas.
5 Outdoor environment limited to playground areas, picnic areas, and other areas of frequent human use.
6 Religious institutions (Churches, temples, and other places of worship) of a small size (occupancy) of 100 persons or less may occupy existing buildings within areas of exterior noise levels ranging from 65 to 75 dB CNEL without providing additional noise insulation for the building.

The Safety and Noise Element also identifies certain land uses as more sensitive to noise than other uses including residential uses and schools. The closest sensitive receptors to the project site include single and multi-family residences to the north, east and west of the site.

A Noise Impact Analysis prepared by LSA (Appendix D) analyzed the potential for noise impacts resulting from the project. As outlined in Section XVI, Transportation/Traffic, the project is expected to generate 388 daily weekday trips and 924 trips on Sundays. The Noise Impact Analysis calculated noise levels on El Toro Road and Jeronimo Road in the vicinity of the project site with and without project traffic. The results of this analysis are outlined in Table 7 below:

Table 7. Existing and Future Traffic Noise Levels Without and With Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway Segment</th>
<th>Existing Traffic Volume</th>
<th>Future Traffic Volumes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Project</td>
<td>Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ADT</td>
<td>CNEL (dBA) 50 feet from Center-line of Outermost Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Toro Road north of Jeronimo Road</td>
<td>30,740</td>
<td>70.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Toro Road south of Jeronimo Road</td>
<td>32,330</td>
<td>71.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeronimo Road west of El Toro Road</td>
<td>21,020</td>
<td>67.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeronimo Road east of El Toro Road</td>
<td>14,490</td>
<td>65.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: LSA 2018
Note: Traffic noise within 50 feet of the roadway centerline should be evaluated with site-specific information.
ADT = average daily traffic
CNEL = Community Noise Equivalent Level
dBA = A-weighted decibels
As shown in Table 7 above, project traffic would generate only 0.1 dBA increase in noise over existing baseline conditions and only on El Toro Road south of Jeronimo Road. When added to project future traffic volumes, project traffic would increase noise 0.3 to 1.6 dBA along El Toro Road and Jeronimo Road in the vicinity of the site. Thus, project traffic would not increase noise by 3 dB or more on a roadway segment and would not exceed the noise standards of the Lake Forest General Plan. Thus, the project would not adversely affect surrounding noise sensitive land uses, and a less than significant impact would result.

b) **Would the project exceed the stationary source noise criteria for the City of Lake Forest as specified by the Exterior noise standards set forth in the Noise Control chapter of the Lake Forest Municipal Code?**

*Less than significant with mitigation.* Stationary noise associated with the project would include short-term construction noise and longer term operational noise, as outlined below.

**Construction Noise.** The City of Lake Forest Municipal Code limits noise associated with construction activities to between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m. on any day except Sundays and Federal holidays, and between the hours of 9:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m. on a Sunday or federal holiday. However, the City does not have noise standards for measuring construction noise. Instead, the Noise Impact Analysis prepared for the project by LSA utilized the Federal Transit Authority’s (FTA) noise impact guidelines. The FTA assessment criteria for construction noise identifies a 1-hour noise level of 90 dBA $L_{eq}$ near residential uses.

During construction, noise would be generated by activities such as grading, heavy equipment operation, building construction, and paving. Construction of the project is expected in several steps over approximately 34 weeks, with each step having its own equipment and noise characteristics. Noise generated by construction equipment, such as backhoes, graders, jackhammers, and forklifts may involve 1 or 2 minutes of full-power operation followed by 3 or 4 minutes at lower settings. According to the Noise Impact Analysis, ambient noise in the project vicinity is 63.7 - 75.4 dBA $L_{eq}$ during daylight hours. Construction noise may approach 85 dBA $L_{eq}$ at the nearest residential uses when construction activities occur near the project site boundary. When construction occurs near the center of the project site, noise levels at the nearest single-family residences, are expected to approach 64 dBA $L_{eq}$. However, construction-related noise impacts would remain below the 90 dBA $L_{eq}$ 1-hour construction noise level established by the FTA and would be less than significant. In addition, the project will be required to incorporate Mitigation Measures NOI-1 through NOI-6, including equipping construction equipment with mufflers and limiting noise producing construction activities to the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m., which would further limit construction noise. Thus, the project would not exceed the stationary source criteria established by the City’s Municipal Code and would have a less than significant impact.

**Mitigation Measures**

**NOI-1** Equip all construction equipment, fixed or mobile, with properly operating and maintained mufflers consistent with manufacturers’ standards. Equipment should also utilize the best available noise control techniques (e.g., use of intake silencers, ducts, engine enclosures, and acoustically attenuating shields or shrouds, wherever feasible).

**NOI-2** Place all stationary construction equipment so that emitted noise is directed away from sensitive receptors nearest the active project site.
NOI-3 Locate equipment staging in areas that would create the greatest possible distance between construction-related noise sources and noise-sensitive receptors nearest the active project site during all project construction.

NOI-4 Install temporary noise barriers around stationary noise sources (such as compressors) and locate stationary noise sources as far from adjacent or nearby sensitive receptors as possible.

NOI-5 Prohibit extended idling time of internal combustion engines.

NOI-6 Limit all noise-producing construction activities to the hours between 7:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m. Monday through Saturday. No construction activity shall be allowed on Sundays and holidays.

**Operational Noise.** During long-term operation of the project, noise would be generated by parking lot activity and heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) equipment. The project would not include the use of amplified instruments or outdoor speakers. Parking lot activities would generate intermittent noise from engine sounds, car doors slamming, car alarms, car sound systems, and people conversing. These activities have the potential to generate approximately 70 dBA $L_{max}$ at 50 feet. The closest sensitive land uses are residential dwelling units located at a distance of approximately 70 feet from the closest parking spaces where they could be exposed to intermittent parking lot noise of up to 67 dBA $L_{max}$. This level is below the City’s 75 dBA $L_{max}$ daytime and 70 dBA $L_{max}$ nighttime intermittent noise thresholds and would result in a less than significant impact.

The City of Lake Forest Municipal Code also contains noise level thresholds for ongoing noise sources which average noise levels over a period of time. The City identifies a maximum permissible exterior ambient noise level for residential uses of 55 dBA $L_{eq}$ during daytime hours (7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.), and 50 dBA $L_{eq}$ during nighttime hours (10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.). The proposed project would utilize York International XYE04 and XYE05 HVAC equipment which would generate 64.3 dBA $L_{eq}$ at a distance of 5 feet. This would result in a maximum noise level of 35.1 dBA $L_{eq}$ at the closest residences to the project site. As these levels would remain below the nighttime noise standard of 50 dBA $L_{eq}$, a less than significant impact would result.

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

*No impact.* Refer to d), below.

d) **For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?**

*No impact.* The project site is located approximately 11 miles southeast of John Wayne Airport, the closest public or private airport to the site. The site is not located within the John Wayne Airport Land Use Plan and would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels. No impact would result.

e) **Would the project expose persons to, or generate, excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?**

*Less than significant impact.* As outlined in the Noise Impact Analysis, vibration refers to ground-borne noise and motion which propagates from a source through soil and rock into the foundations of nearby buildings. Ground-borne vibration has the potential to disturb people and damage buildings. Construction activities associated with the proposed project have the potential to generate
groundborne vibration and noise. Based on the Noise Impact Analysis, construction activities would generate up to 52 vibration velocity in decibels (VdB) at the closest single-family residences to the site. As this level is well below the 72 VdB threshold of distinctly perceptible, a less than significant impact would result.
XIII. Population and Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through an extension of roads or other infrastructure)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis

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

No impact. The proposed project includes the development of two Kingdom Hall buildings that would be used exclusively for religious purposes. Church members are anticipated to travel to the site from Lake Forest and other nearby cities to participate in religious services at the site. The project does not include the development of new homes or the establishment of new businesses that could induce population growth in the City. In addition, the project does not involve the extension of roads or other infrastructure that could also have a growth-inducing effect. Therefore, the project would have no impact.

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

No Impact. The project site is currently vacant and does not contain any housing. Thus, the project would not displace existing housing or necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

c) Would the project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

No impact. The project would not displace existing housing or people and would not necessitate the construction of replacement housing. In addition, historical records indicate the site was previously used as a train station and did not previously support housing or a resident population in the recent past. Thus, no impact would occur.
XIV. Public Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Fire protection?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Police protection?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Schools?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Parks</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Other public facilities?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis

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

1) Fire protection?

*Less than significant impact with mitigation.* The Orange County Fire Authority (OCFA) provides fire protection and suppression, inspection services, paramedic emergency medical services, and hazardous material response to the City. The closest fire station to the site is Fire Station 19 located across El Toro Road, approximately 800 feet east of the project site at 23022 El Toro Road. The fire station includes one engine and is staffed by 3 fire captains, 3 fire apparatus engineers and 6 firefighters.

The Project would increase the temporary population of the site, particularly on Saturdays and Sundays from 9:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. and weeknights from 7:00 p.m. to 9:15 p.m. when services are held. This increase could incrementally increase the number of calls for fire and emergency services. However, the project is not anticipated to place a significant burden on fire protection services, and resources and would not result in the need for a new or substantially altered fire station. Project plans would need to be reviewed and approved by OCFA and the project would contribute development impact fees to OCFA for the development of future fire facilities. In addition, Mitigation Measure PUB-1 will require OCFA approval of a Fire Protection Agreement to ensure the project includes adequate measures to reduce fire risks. Therefore, With Mitigation Measure PUB-1, the project’s impact on fire protection would be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measure**

PUB-1 Prior to issuance of a grading permit: The applicant shall submit evidence of approval by OCFA of an approved Fire Protection Agreement to the Community Development Department.
2) Police protection services?

Less than significant impact. The Orange County Sheriff’s Department (OCSD) provides 24-hour contract law enforcement services to the City of Lake Forest and the project site. The Department maintains an office in Lake Forest at 20202 Windrow Drive, which is located approximately 5 miles northeast of the project site. The City is served by 5 Sergeants, 3 Investigators, 38 Deputies, an Investigative Assistant, 5 Community Services Officers, and a Crime Prevention Specialist. The proposed Kingdom Halls project is not expected to generate many calls for law enforcement services, and a less than significant impact would result to police protection services.

3) Schools?

No impact. The Saddleback Valley Unified School District provides elementary, intermediate, high, and alternative schools to the City of Lake Forest. The proposed project includes the development of two Kingdom Hall religious facilities and would thus not increase the resident or school-age population of the area. Therefore, the project would not increase the need for school facilities or services, and no impact would result.

4) Parks?

No impact. The City of Lake Forest maintains 30 parks with a variety of facilities, resources, and services. The closest park to the project site is the Heroes Park at 25420 Jeronimo Road. As a religious facility, the project would not increase the population of the area or the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks. Therefore, the project would not result in adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered parks, and no impact would result.

5) Other public facilities?

No impact. The proposed project would not impact other public facilities that are not addressed above or in Section XVIII, Utilities and Service Systems. Therefore, no impact would result.
XV. Recreation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis

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

*No impact.* As a religious facility, the project would not increase the population of the area or the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities. Therefore, the project would not contribute to the deterioration of recreational facilities, and no impact would result.

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

*No impact.* The project would not include the development of recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Thus, no impact would result.
## XVI. Transportation / Traffic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic/Circulation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Project ICU (intersection capacity utilization) values at intersections, with the proposed project exceed the City of Lake Forest performance criteria as specified in Table C-3 of the General Plan Circulation Element [Table 8 herein]; and</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) The proposed project includes design features or uses that may cause traffic hazards such as sharp curves, tight turning radii from streets, limited roadway visibility, short merging lanes, uneven road grades, or any other conditions determined by the City traffic engineer to be a hazard.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Result in inadequate emergency access?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs regarding public transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☔</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) The project provides less parking than required, applying the standards found in the City of Lake Forest Municipal Code.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Analysis

**a)** *Would the project significantly impact ICU (intersection capacity utilization) values at intersections or exceed the City of Lake Forest performance criteria as specified in Table C-3 of the General Plan Circulation Element [Table 8 herein]; and*

**Less than significant impact.** A Traffic Impact Analysis conducted by LSA (Appendix E) documented traffic effects associated with the proposed project. As outlined in the report, the project is expected to generate 388 daily trips, including 40 a.m. peak-hour trips, and 154 p.m. peak hour trips on a typical weekday. On a typical Sunday, the project is estimated to generate 924 daily trips and 154 peak hour trips.

The City requires proposed development projects to evaluate peak-hour operations at nearby signalized intersections using the intersection capacity utilization (ICU) methodology. The ICU methodology outlines how often an intersection will experience congestion by comparing the volume-to-capacity (V/C) ratios of conflicting turn movements at an intersection, sums up the
conflicting ratios for each approach, and determines the overall ICU value, which is expressed as intersection level of service (LOS). As outlined in the City of Lake Forest CEQA Significance Thresholds Guide, the City has adopted the following standards:

**Table 8. Level of Service Designations for Signalized Intersections**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ICU Ratio (LOS Volume/Capacity)</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Average Vehicle Delay (seconds)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.00 - 0.60</td>
<td>less than 5.0</td>
<td>Primarily free flow operations at average travel speeds usually about 90 percent of free flow speed. Vehicles can maneuver unimpeded within the traffic stream. Delay at signalized intersections is minimal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>0.61-0.70</td>
<td>5.1 to 15.0</td>
<td>Reasonably unimpeded operations at average travel speeds usually about 70 percent of free flow speed. Ability to maneuver is only slightly restricted and stopped delays are not bothersome. Drivers are not subjected to appreciable tension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.71-0.80</td>
<td>15.1 to 25.0</td>
<td>Represents stable operations, however, ability to maneuver and change lanes in mid-block locations may be more restricted. Longer queues and/or adverse signal coordination may contribute to lower average travel speeds of about 50 percent of free-flow speed. Drivers will experience some appreciable tension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.81-0.90</td>
<td>25.1 to 40.0</td>
<td>Borders on a range in which small increases in flow may cause substantial increases in approach delay, and hence, decreases in arterial speed. Causes range from adverse signal progression, inappropriate signal timing, high volumes, or any combination. For planning purposes, this Level of Service is the lowest that is considered acceptable. Average travel speeds are about 40 percent of free-flow speed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>0.91-1.00</td>
<td>40.1 to 60.0</td>
<td>Characterized by significant approach delays and average travel speeds of one-third of free-flow speed or lower, caused by adverse progression, high signal density, extensive queuing at critical intersections, inappropriate signal timing, or some combination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Above 1.00</td>
<td>greater than 60.0</td>
<td>Characterized by arterial flow at extremely low speeds below one-third to one-quarter of free flow speed. Congestion is likely at critical signalized intersections, resulting in high approach delays. Adverse progression is frequently a contributor to this condition.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Table 2-1, City of Lake Forest CEQA Significance Thresholds Guide

According to the City’s CEQA Significance Thresholds Guide, and the Lake Forest General Plan Circulation Element, an intersection is considered to be at an unsatisfactory level if it exceeds an ICU value of 0.90 and the intersection is at LOS E or F (see Table 9 below).

The TIA analyzed existing and existing plus project levels at the intersection of El Toro Road and Jeronimo Road. The intersection currently has an a.m. peak hour ICU level of 0.67 (LOS B) and a p.m. peak hour ICU level of 0.80 (LOS C). With the proposed project, the a.m. peak hour ICU level would be 0.68 and would continue to operate within LOS B, and have a p.m. peak hour ICU of 0.83 or LOS D, which is still within acceptable levels. For the future condition at this intersection without the proposed project, the intersection is anticipated to operate at LOS C in the a.m. peak hour and LOS D in the p.m. peak hour, and these conditions would not change with the addition of the proposed project. Thus, the project would not adversely affect adopted ICU values, and a less than significant impact would result.
Table 9. City of Lake Forest Performance Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calculation Methodology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of service (LOS) to be based on peak hour intersection capacity utilization (ICU) values calculated using the following values:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturation Flow Rate: 1,700 vehicles/hour/lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearance Interval: .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-Turn-On-Red Utilization Factor*: .75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* “De-facto” right-turn lane is assumed in the ICU calculation if 19 feet from edge to outside of through-lane exists and parking is prohibited during peak periods.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOS “D” (peak hour ICU less than or equal to .90) for all intersections except Critical Intersections where LOS “E” (peak hour ICU less than or equal to 1.00) is acceptable with the requirement that regular monitoring take place.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Requirement for Project Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For ICU greater than the acceptable level of service, mitigation of the project contribution is required to bring intersection back to acceptable level of service or to no-project conditions if project contribution to the ICU is greater than .01.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Table 2-2, CEQA Significance Thresholds Guide

b) Would the project include design features or uses that may cause traffic hazards such as sharp curves, tight turning radii from streets, limited roadway visibility, short merging lanes, uneven road grades, or any other conditions determined by the City traffic engineer to be a hazard?

No impact. The Traffic Impact Analysis prepared by LSA evaluated project design features that may cause traffic hazards. The project is not expected to generated traffic hazards associated with sharp curves, tight turning radii from adjacent streets, or other concerns. Regarding site distance, El Toro Road has a speed limit of 50 miles per hour (MPH), and the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) 2-17 Highway Design Manual recommends a corner sight distance of 550 feet for this design speed. More than 550 feet of sight distance is available for the project driveway off El Toro Road from its intersection with Jeronimo. In addition, because the project driveway is right-in/right-out only, drivers exiting the site would not have conflicting oncoming traffic from the south. Thus, the project would have no impact related to traffic design considerations.
c) *Would the project conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of* 
   *effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of* 
   *transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the* 
   *circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways,* 
   *pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?*

   **Less than significant impact.** Refer to Response a), above. The City of Lake Forest has established an 
   ICU methodology for determining transportation impacts and the project would have a less than 
   significant impact.

d) *Would the project conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not* 
   *limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by* 
   *the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?*

   **No impact.** The Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA) is responsible for preparing the 
   congestion management program (CMP) for the County. The 2011 OCTA Congestion Management 
   Program Preparation Manual identifies El Toro Road as part of the CMP Highway System. In addition, 
   the CMP also identifies CMP intersections and requires that local jurisdictions maintain an LOS Level 
   of E or better (i.e., an ICU of 1.0 or better) at all CMP intersections. The closest CMP intersections to 
   the project site are the intersection of El Toro Road and Interstate 5, located approximately 2.25 
   miles southwest of the project site; and El Toro Road and Trabuco Road; located approximately 2 
   miles northwest of the project. Traffic generated by the project would not affect these CMP 
   intersections or reduce their LOS or ICU levels. Thus, no impact would result.

e) *Would the project result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic* 
   *levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?*

   **No impact.** The project site is located approximately 11 miles southeast of John Wayne Airport, the 
   closest airport to the site. The project would not affect air traffic patterns at John Wayne Airport or 
   other area airports in the area and no impact would result.

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

   **No impact.** The Orange County Fire Authority (OCFA) and the Orange County Sheriff’s Department 
   (OCSD) are responsible for coordinating emergency operations in the event of a disaster. In addition, 
   the City of Lake Forest Director of Public Works is responsible for cooperating with OCFA, OCSD, and 
   other agencies on roadway operations to maximize traffic safety. During construction and operation, 
   the proposed project would result in a slight increase in cars and trucks accessing El Toro Road. 
   However, these trips are not expected to impact traffic operations, and the project would not impair 
   implementation of emergency access along this corridor. In addition, construction of the project 
   would not result in any temporary road closures or detours that could affect emergency access and 
   no impact would result.

g) *Would the project conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs regarding public transit, bicycle* 
   *or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?*

   **No impact.** The Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA) operates Bus Route 89 along El Toro 
   Road adjacent to the project site. The route provides service from Mission Viejo to Laguna Beach 
   through the City of Lake Forest. The closest bus stop to the project site is located at the intersection 
   of El Toro Road and Jeronimo Road, approximately 1,000 feet northeast of the site.
Sidewalks are located along both sides of El Toro Road near the site, which facilitate pedestrian access in and around the area. According to the City’s General Plan, no bicycle routes are located along El Toro Road. As previously identified, the project is expected to generate 388 vehicular trips on a typical weekday and 924 vehicular trips on a typical Sunday. While some employees and visitors to the site may travel by foot, bicycle, or transit, the vast majority are expected to access the site by car. Thus, the project would not affect or decrease the performance of existing public transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities in the area and no impact would result.

Parking

h) **Would the project provide less parking than required, applying the standards found in the City of Lake Forest Municipal Code.**

*No impact.* The proposed project will consist of two new Kingdom Hall buildings with 125 fixed seats and four wheelchair spaces each. The City of Lake Forest Municipal Code (Section 9.168.070) requires that churches, temples, and other places of assembly provide 1 parking space for every 3 fixed seats within the main auditorium. Based on this parking rate, the proposed project would require 86 parking spaces. The project includes a total of 128 parking spaces within the proposed parking lot on-site, which exceeds the Municipal Code requirement by 42 spaces. Thus, no impact would result.
**XVII. Tribal Cultural Resources**

| Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in a Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is: |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation | Less than Significant Impact | No Impact |
| a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k)? | | | |
| b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe. | | | |

**Analysis**

**a) Is the project site listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k)?**

*Less than significant impact.* A Cultural Resources records search identified one cultural resource in the vicinity of the project site. P-30-176663 consists of an approximately 14.7-mile segment of the Burlington Northern Santa Fe (formerly Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe) Railway dating back to the 1880s. A portion of this railway was located immediately west/southwest of the project site in approximately the same location as the modern railway. In addition, project site likely contained the historic El Toro train depot, consisting of a small wood-framed structure serving as a depot for the adjacent rail line. However, the railroad tracks and the train depot were demolished decades ago, possibly in the late 1960s in conjunction with demolition of part of El Toro Road prior to construction of the roadway overpass and current railroad. No remnants of the historic railway or the train depot were found to exist on the project site, and the cultural resources site does not appear eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. Thus, the project would have a less than significant impact on historical resources.

**b) Is the project site a resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.**

*Less than significant with mitigation.* Assembly Bill 52 requires that a lead agency begin consultation with California Native American tribes that request consultation prior to release of a project negative declaration, mitigated declaration, or environmental impact report. Tribes who receive a formal notification have 30 days to respond and request consultation.

In addition to AB 52, Senate Bill 18 requires that a lead agency consult with Native American tribes for any project involving adoption of an amendment to a general plan or specific plan. As the proposed project includes a General Plan Amendment to change the land use designation on the project site.
from Transportation Corridor to Public Facility, SB 18 also applies. The requirements of SB 18 are similar to AB 52 but give tribes 90 days to respond and request consultation.

On July 20, 2018, the City of Lake Forest, as lead agency on the Kingdom Halls project, formally initiated the AB 52 consultation process and provided formal notification to the Native American Tribes that have requested notification for consultation for the purposes of AB 52. Letters were sent by certified mail to four tribes requesting notification. At the conclusion of the AB 52 notification period on August 20, 2018, no requests for consultation were received.

Also on July 20, 2018, the City of Lake Forest formally initiated the SB 18 consultation process and provided formal notification to California Native American tribes as identified by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). Letters were sent by certified mail to nine tribes requesting notification. At the conclusion of the SB 18 notification period on October 18, 2018, no requests for consultation were received.

The project site has been previously graded and disturbed and includes undocumented fill materials throughout the site. Based on the lack of known cultural resources on the site, the presence of fill materials and the lack of requests for AB 52 and SB 18 consultation, the City has determined there are no known tribal cultural resources on the project site. However, if grading activities associated with project construction disturb native soils that may contain tribal cultural resources, the incorporation of Mitigation Measure CULT-1 will ensure that grading activities be ceased and that the appropriate authorities, including a Native American monitor as appropriate, be consulted in the event that cultural resources or human remains are encountered on the site. With the incorporation of Mitigation Measure CULT-1, potential impacts to tribal cultural resources would be less than significant.
XVIII. Utilities and Service Systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis

a) **Would the project exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?**

Less than significant impact. Refer to e), below.

b) **Would the project require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?**

Less than significant impact. Refer to d) and e), below.

c) **Would the project require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?**

Less than significant impact. The proposed project would introduce 69,118 square feet of impervious surfaces to the site which could potentially increase local runoff and contribute suspended solids/sediment, oil and grease and trash and debris to the downstream storm water system. However, according to the Conceptual Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) prepared for the project by HEITEC (Appendix H), the project has incorporated adequate storm water collection and detention facilities to reduce potential impacts to downstream habitats and conveyance systems. Runoff from the site would sheet flow into landscaped islands and vegetative channels and the overall flow from the site will be conveyed to a dry extended detention basin (DEDB) located at the southern corner of the site. THE DEDB would allow runoff to percolate and discharge pollutants in place before discharging into the local storm water system at pre-development rates. Thus, the project would not have a significant environmental impact related to storm water discharge.
d) **Would the project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?**

*Less than significant impact.* According to the Lake Forest General Plan, several special service districts provide water and wastewater service to the City. The El Toro Water District (ETWD) and the Irvine Ranch Water District (IRWD) provide water and wastewater services in the project area. Although technically located in ETWD’s service area, through mutual agreement, the project would receive water and wastewater services from IRWD, because their facilities are more proximate to the project site (Rios, 10/29/18). The IRWD serves a population of 380,000 and a service area of 181 square miles including the City of Irvine and portions of the cities of Lake Forest, Costa Mesa, Newport Beach, Orange, and Tustin, and the unincorporated area of Orange County. The IRWD is under the jurisdiction of the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board (SARWQCB), one of nine Regional Water Quality Control Boards throughout California tasked with protecting State water quality at a regional level.

The IRWD imports water from the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California through its member agency, the Municipal Water District of Orange County. The IRWD Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) represents the District’s anticipated present and future water resource needs over a 20-year planning period. The UWMP water demand, generation and supply estimates are based on General Plan land use designations and assumptions. With the conservation measures and facilities outlined in the IRWD UWMP, the district projects that it will have adequate entitlements and capacity to provide water to its service area through its planning horizon of 2035.

As previously identified, the project includes a General Plan Amendment from Transportation Corridor to Public Facility to accommodate the proposed religious use. Although not directly consistent with the UWMP land use assumptions for the site, the water demand requirements of the project are anticipated to be minimal. The project is anticipated to utilize 6,240 gallons of water per week for landscaping and normal operation of the buildings and the IRWD has indicated it has adequate entitlements and capacity to serve the site as stated in the “Water Purveyor’s Statement of Certification,” provided from IRWD to the applicant on November 29, 2018. The project would not require the construction of new water facilities, or the expansion of existing facilities. In addition, irrigation required for the proposed landscape plan would comply with the requirements of the City of Lake Forest Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance (Municipal Code Section 9.146.110). The project will be required to develop a technical memorandum or Sub-Area Master Plan (SAMP) addendum with IRWD to address any improvements needed for water service, and thus, project impacts to water service and supplies would be less than significant.

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

*Less than significant impact.* The proposed project includes the development of two Kingdom Hall facilities totaling 6,624 square feet. The project is not anticipated to place an undue burden on wastewater facilities, or exceed the wastewater treatment requirements of the SARWQCB or IRWD. In addition, the IRWD has indicated it has adequate wastewater capacity to serve the site as stated in the “Sewering Agency’s Statement of Certification” provided by IRWD to the applicant on November 29, 2018. The project would not require the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities, or the expansion of existing facilities. The project would be responsible for constructing on-site wastewater treatment conveyance systems and paying standard sewer connection fees to IRWD. The project will be required to develop a technical memorandum of SAMP addendum with IRWD to...
address any improvements needed for wastewater service, and Thus, the project would have a less than significant impact on wastewater treatment facilities and capacity.

f) Would the project be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?

Less than significant impact. CR&R Incorporated provides solid waste and recycling collection services to the project while Orange County Waste & Recycling provides trash and recycling disposal services to the area. Three landfills accept waste from the project area. They are the Olinda Alpha Landfill located near Brea; the Frank R. Bowerman Landfill near Irvine; and the Prima Deshecha Landfill near San Juan Capistrano. The proposed project would generate solid waste and recyclable materials during construction and operation. However, the increase in solid waste generation is not expected to be substantial and existing landfills in the area have additional capacity. Thus, the project would have a less than significant impact on landfill capacity.

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

Less than significant impact. The proposed project would comply with all Federal State and local statutes and regulations regarding solid waste and recycling, including the Lake Forest Integrated Waste Management Ordinance. Compliance with applicable regulations will ensure the project implements measures to reduce solid waste generation and increase recycling. Thus, the project would have a less than significant impact related to solid waste.
### XIX. Mandatory Findings of Significance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable (&quot;Cumulatively considerable&quot; means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the project have environmental effects which would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Analysis

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

*Less than significant with mitigation.* As outlined in this Initial Study, there are no rare, endangered, or threatened plant or animal species on the project site. The project would remove eight mature eucalyptus trees along the northeastern site boundary. However, eucalyptus trees are not considered rare, endangered, or threatened, and the removal of eucalyptus trees is permitted by City ordinance. Thus, the project would not have the potential to degrade plant or animal species or habitats.

Regarding California’s history and prehistory, the project site has a low potential for cultural and paleontological resources, and the incorporation of CULT-1 and CULT-2 will ensure that any resources identified during earthwork activities are appropriately handled.

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

*Less than significant with mitigation.* As outlined in this Initial Study, all environmental impacts related to the proposed Kingdom Halls project would be less than significant with the incorporation of 11 mitigation measures. There are no impacts considered to be individually limited, but cumulatively considerable, associated with the project. The project would introduce two, relatively small scale religious facilities to a vacant site and would not adversely affect the environment or the surrounding area. Thus, the project would have a less than significant cumulative effect on the environment with mitigation.
c)  *Does the project have environmental effects, which would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?*

*Less than significant with mitigation.* Impacts related to aesthetics, air quality, geology and soils, greenhouse gas emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, noise, and other environmental issues have the potential to adversely affect human beings. However, as outlined in this report, the project would not have a significant impact regarding most of these issues. Mitigation Measures GEO-1, HAZ-1, NOI-1 through NOI-6, and PUB-1 have been incorporated into the project to ensure the project does not have adverse impacts related to geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, noise, and fire protection. Thus, with the incorporation of mitigation, the project would have a less than significant impact on human beings.
XX. Summary of Mitigation Measures

This Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration includes the following mitigation measures related to Cultural Resources and Tribal Cultural Resources; Geology and Soils; Hazards and Hazardous Materials; and Noise.

V. Cultural Resources and XVII. Tribal Cultural Resources

Mitigation Measures

CULT-1 If subsurface deposits believed to be cultural or human in origin are discovered during construction, all work must halt within a 50-foot radius of the discovery. An archaeological monitor or a Principal Investigator, meeting the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualification Standards for prehistoric and historic archaeology, shall be afforded a reasonable amount of time to evaluate the significance of the find. Work cannot continue at the discovery site until the archaeologist conducts sufficient research and data collection to make a determination that the resource is either 1) not cultural in origin; or 2) not potentially significant or eligible for listing on the NRHP or CRHR. If a potentially eligible resource is encountered, the archaeologist, the lead agency, and the project proponent shall arrange for either 1) total avoidance of the resource, if possible; or 2) test excavations to evaluate eligibility and, if eligible, total data recovery as mitigation. The determination shall be formally documented in writing and submitted to the lead agency as verification that the provisions in CEQA/National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) for managing unanticipated discoveries have been met. In the event that evidence of human remains is discovered, construction activities within 50 feet of the discovery will be halted or diverted, and the requirements above will be implemented. Depending on the occurrence, a larger radius may be necessary and will be required at the discretion of the on-site archaeologist. In addition, the provisions of §7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code, §5097.98 of the California Public Resources Code, and Assembly Bill 2641 will be implemented. When human remains are discovered, state law requires that the discovery be reported to the County Coroner (§7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code) and that reasonable protection measures be taken during construction to protect the discovery from disturbance (AB 2641). If the Coroner determines the remains are Native American, the Coroner notifies the NAHC, which then designates a Native American MLD for the project (§5097.98 of the California Public Resources Code). The MLD may not be the same person as the tribal monitor. The designated MLD then has 48 hours from the time access to the property is granted to make recommendations concerning treatment of the remains (AB 2641). If the landowner does not agree with the recommendations of the MLD, the NAHC can mediate (§5097.94 of the California Public Resources Code). If no agreement is reached, the landowner must rebury the remains where they will not be further disturbed (§5097.98 of the California Public Resources Code). This will also include either recording the site with the NAHC or the appropriate Information Center; using an open space or conservation zoning designation or easement; or recording a document with the county in which the property is located (AB 2641). Prior to issuance of any building permits, the applicant shall provide the City with either the required documentation from the archaeologist, as described in this mitigation measure, or a signed written statement from the contractor performing the grading activities, stating that no subsurface deposits, believed to be cultural or human origin, were discovered during grading activities.
CULT-2 If subsurface paleontological resources (i.e. fossil remains) are discovered during construction, all work must halt within a 50-foot radius of the discovery and the City of Lake Forest shall be notified. The project applicant shall retain a City-approved paleontologist to assess the significance of the find. Impacts to any significant resources shall be mitigated to a less-than-significant level through methods determined adequate by the paleontologist and approved by the City. Prior to issuance of any building permits, the applicant shall provide the City with either a report of findings with an appended itemized inventory of specimens, or a signed written statement from the contractor performing the grading activities, stating that no paleontological resources were discovered during grading activities.

VI. Geology and Soils

Mitigation Measure

GEO-1 The project grading and building plans submitted to the City shall include notes and/or drawings demonstrating conformance with the following: All fill materials within the footprint of the proposed buildings shall be removed, excavated, and thoroughly cleaned prior to backfill placement and/or construction. After removal of undocumented fill within the proposed building footprints, foundations and floor slab areas should be supported on engineered fill. The proposed buildings may be supported by shallow spread footings bearing on engineered fill extending to a minimum depth of 2 feet below the bottom of the footings or to the bottom of the undocumented fill encountered during construction, whichever is greater. The bottom of the overexcavation should be scarified, moisture conditions and compacted to the requirement in Section 4.2.4 of the Geotechnical Engineering Report prepared by Terracon and dated November 22, 2017. Due to the expansive nature of the clayey soils, the upper 18 inches of engineered fill placed beneath floor slabs should comprise low volume change import materials. Any deviation to the recommendations in the Geotechnical Report should be reviewed and approved by the Engineer of Record and the City prior to implementation.

VIII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Mitigation Measure

HAZ-1 Prior to issuance of a grading permit for the proposed project, a Construction Contingency Plan shall be developed by a qualified environmental professional in consultation with the City Engineer. At a minimum, the Construction Contingency Plan shall include guidance for handling, segregating, and characterizing potentially contaminated soil generated during grading activities to minimize impacts to worker safety and the environment. The Plan shall also identify that the Contractor must verify that all exported soils are not contaminated with hazardous materials above regulatory thresholds in consultation with a Phase II/Site Characterization Specialist. If export soils are determined to be contaminated above regulatory thresholds, the Phase II/Site Characterization Specialist shall recommend proper handling, use, and/or disposal of these soils.
XII. Noise

Mitigation Measures

NOI-1 Equip all construction equipment, fixed or mobile, with properly operating and maintained mufflers consistent with manufacturers’ standards. Equipment should also utilize the best available noise control techniques (e.g., use of intake silencers, ducts, engine enclosures, and acoustically attenuating shields or shrouds, wherever feasible).

NOI-2 Place all stationary construction equipment so that emitted noise is directed away from sensitive receptors nearest the active project site.

NOI-3 Locate equipment staging in areas that would create the greatest possible distance between construction-related noise sources and noise-sensitive receptors nearest the active project site during all project construction.

NOI-4 Install temporary noise barriers around stationary noise sources (such as compressors) and locate stationary noise sources as far from adjacent or nearby sensitive receptors as possible.

NOI-5 Prohibit extended idling time of internal combustion engines.

NOI-6 Limit all noise producing construction activities to the hours between 7:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m. Monday through Saturday. No construction activity shall be allowed on Sundays and holidays.

XIV. Public Services

Mitigation Measure

PUB-1 Prior to issuance of a grading permit: The applicant shall submit evidence of approval by OCFA of an approved Fire Protection Agreement to the Planning Division.
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