

## **SECTION 2.0 INTRODUCTION**

### **2.1 PURPOSE OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

This Environmental Impact Report (EIR) has been prepared to evaluate the potential environmental impacts associated with the construction and implementation of the proposed Newport Banning Ranch Project (Project). The EIR has been prepared in conformance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (*California Public Resources Code* [PRC] §§21000 et seq.) and the State CEQA Guidelines (Title 14, *California Code of Regulations* [CCR], Chapter 3, §§15000 et seq.). The EIR has also been prepared in accordance with Newport Beach City Council Policy K-3, “Implementation Procedures for the California Environmental Quality Act”.

The City of Newport Beach (City) is the “public agency which has the principal responsibility for carrying out or approving the project” and, as such, is the “Lead Agency” for this Project under CEQA (14 CCR §15367). CEQA requires the Lead Agency to consider the information contained in an EIR prior to taking any discretionary action. This EIR is intended to provide information to the Lead Agency and other public agencies, the general public, and decision makers regarding the potential environmental impacts from the construction and operation of the proposed Project. The City, as the Lead Agency, will review and consider this EIR in its decision to approve, revise, or deny the proposed Project.

Pursuant to CEQA, “[t]he purpose of the environmental impact report is to identify the significant effects on the environment of a project, to identify alternatives to the proposed project, and to indicate the manner in which significant environmental effects can be mitigated or avoided” (PRC §21002.1[a]). An EIR is the most comprehensive form of environmental documentation identified in CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines, and provides the information needed to assess the environmental consequences of a proposed project to the extent feasible. EIRs are intended to provide an objective, factually supported, full-disclosure analysis of the environmental consequences associated with a project that may have the potential to result in significant adverse environmental impacts.

### **2.2 TYPE OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

This EIR analyzes the potential environmental impacts related to the implementation of the proposed Newport Banning Ranch Project, which is described in Section 3.0, Project Description. This EIR provides a comprehensive evaluation of the reasonably anticipated scope of the proposed Project. It is intended to serve as an informational document for public agency decision makers and the general public regarding (1) the objectives and components of the proposed Project; (2) any potentially significant environmental impacts (individual and cumulative) that may be associated with the planning, construction, and operation of the Project; (3) an appropriate and feasible Mitigation Program; (4) and alternatives that may be adopted to reduce or avoid these significant impacts.

In accordance with Section 15161 of the State CEQA Guidelines, a Project EIR “examines the environmental impacts of a specific development project. This type of EIR should focus primarily on the changes in the environment that would result from the development project. The EIR shall examine all phases of the project including planning, construction, and operation”.

This EIR is further intended to serve as the primary environmental document for all entitlements associated with the proposed Project, including all discretionary approvals requested or required

in order to implement the Project. The Lead Agency can approve subsequent actions without additional environmental documentation unless otherwise required by Section 21166 of the CEQA Statutes and Section 15162 of the State CEQA Guidelines. Section 21166 of the CEQA Statutes states that:

When an environmental impact report has been prepared for a project pursuant to this division, no subsequent or supplemental environmental impact report shall be required by the lead agency or by any responsible agency, unless one or more of the following events occurs:

- (a) Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the environmental impact report.
- (b) Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is being undertaken which will require major revisions in the environmental impact report.
- (c) New information, which was not known and could not have been known at the time the environmental impact report was certified as complete, becomes available.

Section 15162 of the State CEQA Guidelines states that:

- (a) When an EIR has been certified or a negative declaration adopted for a project, no subsequent EIR shall be prepared for that project unless the lead agency determines, on the basis of substantial evidence in the light of the whole record, one or more of the following:
  - (1) Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;
  - (2) Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or Negative Declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or
  - (3) New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete or the Negative Declaration was adopted, shows any of the following:
    - (A) The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or negative declaration;
    - (B) Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;
    - (C) Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more

significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or

(D) Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

(b) If changes to a project or its circumstances occur or new information becomes available after adoption of a negative declaration, the lead agency shall prepare a subsequent EIR if required under subdivision (a). Otherwise the lead agency shall determine whether to prepare a subsequent negative declaration, an addendum, or no further documentation.

(c) Once a project has been approved, the lead agency's role in project approval is completed, unless further discretionary approval on that project is required. Information appearing after an approval does not require reopening of that approval. If after the project is approved, any of the conditions described in subdivision (a) occurs, a subsequent EIR or negative declaration shall only be prepared by the public agency which grants the next discretionary approval for the project, if any. In this situation no other responsible agency shall grant an approval for the project until the subsequent EIR has been certified or subsequent negative declaration adopted.

(d) A subsequent EIR or subsequent negative declaration shall be given the same notice and public review as required under Section 15087 or Section 15072. A subsequent EIR or negative declaration shall state where the previous document is available and can be reviewed.

## **2.2.1 STANDARDS OF ADEQUACY UNDER CEQA**

While the Sections 15120 to 15132 of the State CEQA Guidelines generally describe the content of an EIR, CEQA does not contain specific, detailed, quantified standards for the content of environmental documents. Section 15151 of the State CEQA Guidelines states:

An EIR should be prepared with a sufficient degree of analysis to provide decision makers with information that enables them to make a decision that intelligently takes account of environmental consequences. An evaluation of the environmental effects of a proposed project need not be exhaustive, but the sufficiency of an EIR is to be reviewed in light of what is reasonably feasible. Disagreement among experts does not make an EIR inadequate, but the EIR should summarize the main points of disagreement among the experts. The courts have not looked for perfection but for adequacy, and a good faith effort at full disclosure.

## **2.2.2 REVIEW OF AN EIR**

The City as the Lead Agency, which has the principal responsibility for processing and approving the Project, along with other public agencies with direct interest in the Project (e.g., responsible and trustee agencies including the California Coastal Commission), may use this EIR in their decision-making or permitting processes and will consider the information in this EIR in combination with other information that may be presented during the CEQA process. In

addition, this EIR provides the analysis in support of the Mitigation Project that will, if the Project is approved, be made conditions of the Project and implemented through the CEQA-mandated Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.

In accordance with CEQA, public agencies are required to make appropriate findings for each potentially significant environmental impact identified in the EIR if it decides to approve the project. If the EIR identifies significant environmental impacts that cannot be mitigated to a less than significant level through the adoption of mitigation measures or project alternatives, the Lead Agency (and responsible agencies using this CEQA document for their respective permits or approvals) must decide whether the benefits of the proposed Project outweigh any identified significant environmental effects that cannot be mitigated to below a threshold of significance. If the agency decides that the overriding considerations, including Project benefits, outweigh the unavoidable impacts, then the agency (Lead Agency or responsible agency) is required to adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations, which states the reasons that support its actions.

The Lead Agency's actions involved in the implementation of the proposed Project are described in Section 3.0, Project Description. Other agencies that may have discretionary approval over the Project, or components thereof, including responsible and trustee agencies, are also described in the Project Description.

### **2.3 SCOPE OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

This EIR provides a comprehensive evaluation of the reasonably anticipated scope of the proposed Project. It is intended to serve as an informational document for public agency decision makers and the general public regarding (1) the objectives and components of the proposed Project; (2) any potentially significant environmental impacts (individual and cumulative) that may be associated with the planning, construction, and operation of the Project; and (3) appropriate and feasible mitigation measures and alternatives that may be adopted to reduce or eliminate these significant impacts.

#### **2.3.1 SCOPING PROCESS**

In compliance with the State CEQA Guidelines, the City has taken steps to maximize opportunities for the public and other public agencies to participate in the environmental review process. The scope of this EIR includes issues identified in consultation with the City during the Notice of Preparation (NOP) comment period; two public scoping meetings; and environmental issues raised by agencies and the general public in response to the scoping process and the NOP's circulation. Please refer to Appendix A for a copy of the NOP, Scoping Meeting notices, all written comments received, and transcripts of the two Scoping Meetings.

#### **2.3.2 NOTICE OF PREPARATION**

An NOP was prepared and distributed to affected agencies and interested parties for a 30-day public review period beginning March 18, 2009. The NOP describes the Project and identifies all potential environmental effects that are expected to be addressed in the EIR. Agencies and the public were invited to review and comment on the NOP. The review and comment period closed on April 17, 2009. The following parties provided comments on the NOP to the City.

##### **Federal Agencies**

None

### **State Agencies**

California Coastal Commission

California Department of Conservation, Division of Oil, Gas and Geothermal Resources

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

California Department of Transportation, District 12

California Department of Fish and Game, South Coast Region

Local Agency Formation Commission, Orange County

Native American Heritage Commission (2 letters)

California Governor's Office of Planning and Research, State Clearinghouse and Planning Unit

### **Regional Agencies**

South Coast Air Quality Management District

### **Orange County Agencies**

Airport Land Use Commission for Orange County

Orange County Fire Authority

OC Community Development

### **Local Agencies**

City of Costa Mesa

City of Huntington Beach (2 letters)

City of Newport Beach, Environmental Quality Affairs Citizens Advisory Committee (EQAC)

### **Special Districts**

Mesa Consolidated Water District

Newport-Mesa Unified School District

Orange County Sanitation District

Orange County Transportation Authority

Orange County Vector Control District

### **Organizations/Other**

California Cultural Resource Preservation Alliance, Inc.

California Native Plant Society, Orange County Chapter

Gabrielino-Tongva Tribe

Banning Ranch Conservancy (Sandra L. Genis)

Banning Ranch Conservancy (Robert Hamilton)

Banning Ranch Conservancy (Steve Ray)

Banning Ranch Conservancy: Sierra Club Banning Ranch Park and Preserve Task Force  
(Terry Welsh)

Natural Resources Defense Council

Save Banning Ranch

Save Banning Ranch: Soil/Water/Air Protection Enterprise (SWAPE)

Sea and Sage Audubon Society

Sierra Club

Sierra Club, Angeles Chapter

### **Businesses**

Southern California Gas Company

### **Individuals**

Teresa Barnwell

Bruce Bartram (2 letters)

Denny Bean

Sharon Boles

Cynthia Breatore (2 letters)

Brian Burnett

Steve Coyne

Alfred G. Cruz, Jr.

Mansour and Mariam Djadali

Matthew Erwin

Natalie Fogarty

Monique Friend

J. Edward Guilmette

Gary Gumbert

R.E. Hageman

Steven R. James

Dotty Kauffenberg

Deborah Koken (3 letters)

Mike and Dorothy Kraus

Wendy Leece

Joann Lombardo

Conrad Maher

Paul Malkemus

James T. Mansfield, Banning Ranch  
Task Force

Frederick Marsh

Paul Moreno

Kevin Nelson

Torre Niles

John Perry

Melody Perry

Gerard Proccacino

Norbert Puff (2 letters)

James R. Quigg

Johntommy Rosas

Michael C. Siebert

Robert Siebert

Debra Stephen

Dave Sutherland

Jan D. Vandersloot

Linda Vas

Terry Welsh

### 2.3.3 SCOPING MEETINGS

During the NOP review period, two Scoping Meetings were held on April 2, 2009, to solicit additional suggestions on the content of the Newport Banning Ranch EIR. One scoping meeting was held for agencies and one meeting for the general public. Attendees were provided an opportunity to identify verbally or in writing the issues they felt should be addressed in this EIR. The following parties provided comments to the City during the respective Scoping Meetings.

#### **Public Agency Scoping Meeting**

Michael Mohler, Project Applicant representative

Ed Brannon, State of California Department of Conservation, Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources

Chris Uzo-Diribe, OC Planning

Paul Frost, State of California Department of Conservation, Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources

Eric Chavez, National Marine Fisheries Services

Michelle Ma, Coastline Community College

#### **Public Scoping Meeting**

Michael Mohler

Paul Gold (comment card)

Dean Reinemann (comment card)

Sharon Wright (comment card)

Terry Welsh

Bruce Bartram

Kevin Nelson

Dorothy Kraus

Rod Hageman

Patricia Weber

James Quigg

Jan Vandersloot

Melody Perry

Steve Ray

Stephanie Barger

Sandra Genis

Jennifer Irani

Ginny Lombardi

Sue Williams

Chris Bunyan

Matt Streiff

Brian Burnett

Norm Suker

Steven Brown

## 2.4 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY/UNRESOLVED ISSUES AND ISSUES TO BE ADDRESSED IN THE EIR

### 2.4.1 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY AND UNRESOLVED ISSUES

CEQA requires that areas of controversy or unresolved issues be identified up front as part of the EIR. The following issues pertaining to the proposed Project were raised during the scoping process. Where these issues are addressed in the EIR is noted.

- **Appropriate Land Uses.** During the scoping process, differing viewpoints were expressed regarding the City's General Plan land use alternatives of development versus open space for the Project site. A segment of the community expressed the opinion that it is important to preserve the site for future acquisition as open space. As a means of addressing this issue, the Project provides approximately 252 acres (or 63 percent of the total acreage) as open space. Section 7.0, Alternatives to the Proposed Project, demonstrates that the use of the property as open space would be consistent with the *City of Newport Beach General Plan's* priority land use designation as "Open Space". This issue is addressed in Section 4.1, Land Use and Related Planning Programs, and Section 7.0, Alternatives to the Proposed Project.
- **Land Use Consistency and Compatibility.** Requests were made to assess the Project's consistency with the *City of Newport Beach General Plan* policies regarding land use consistency, ability to reduce citywide traffic from the 1998 General Plan projections, and reduction of citywide commercial and office development from 1998 General Plan buildout, among others. Concerns were raised regarding the density of proposed residential development in the eastern portion of the Project site and its compatibility with off-site land uses. These issues are addressed in Section 4.1, Land Use and Related Planning Programs; Section 4.2, Aesthetics and Visual Resources; and in Section 7.0, Alternatives to the Proposed Project.
- **Off-Site Property Acquisition.** The Project proposes the construction of North Bluff Road and the extension of 16<sup>th</sup> Street and 15<sup>th</sup> Street on to the Project site, consistent with the Master Plan of Streets and Highways from the *City of Newport Beach General Plan* Circulation Element. These roadways would require the right-of-way that is not currently in the control of the City or the Project Applicant (Applicant). For North Bluff Road and 16<sup>th</sup> Street, a portion of the roadway would be on property owned by Newport Mesa Unified School District (School District). Half-width roadway improvements on North Bluff Road north of 16<sup>th</sup> Street for approximately 800 feet are proposed on the School District's property. The construction of this segment of North Bluff Road would require acquisition by the Applicant or the authorization for use of right-of-way from the School District. The Applicant has initiated discussions with the School District regarding the extension of the roadway along the perimeter of the property, but to date this issue has not been resolved. If an agreement is not reached between the Applicant and the School District, North Bluff Road would need to be reconfigured to be completely on the Newport Banning Ranch property because cities cannot initiate eminent domain with a school district. This would result in minor modifications to the layout of the residential development proposed west of North Bluff Road and the north Community Park area. The potential realignment of the road would not change the extent of the Project impacts, as identified in this EIR, because the area proposed for residential and park development is assumed to be disturbed as a part of the Project.



Property acquisition by the Applicant or the City is also required to allow for the extension of 15<sup>th</sup> Street from its existing terminus at Monrovia Avenue onto the Project site. There is an existing office building and associated parking lot between the Newport Banning Ranch property line and Monrovia Avenue. The extension of this road is shown on the Master Plan of Streets and Highways from the *City of Newport Beach General Plan* Circulation Element and would displace approximately 25 parking spaces associated with the existing office building. The Applicant has initiated discussions with the property owner, but to date this issue has not been resolved. If an agreement is not reached, the City can initiate eminent domain with the property owner.

- **Water Quality.** Concerns were raised regarding the Project's potential water quality impacts on Newport Bay and the Pacific Ocean as well as siltation issues. These issues are addressed in Section 4.3, Geology and Soils, and Section 4.4, Hydrology and Water Quality.
- **Biological Resources.** The Project site is located within the boundaries of the Orange County Central-Coastal Natural Community Conservation Plan/Habitat Conservation Plan (NCCP/HCP). The purpose of the NCCP/HCP Program is to provide long-term, large-scale protection of natural vegetation communities and wildlife diversity while allowing compatible land uses and appropriate development and growth. The differing viewpoint between organizations and individuals regarding what constitutes an appropriate balance of development and conservation continues to be an area of controversy. The Project site supports both Endangered and Threatened species. Commenters noted that the analysis must be based on not only the City's criteria but also California Coastal Act criteria, particularly with respect to Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas and the provision of buffers between development and sensitive biological areas. These issues are addressed primarily in Section 4.6, Biological Resources and Section 7.0, Alternatives to the Proposed Project.
- **Oilfield Remediation.** Questions were raised regarding the plans for abandoning oil wells on the Project site and the ongoing oil operations as a part of the proposed Project. Site remediation is required as a part of the Project. Concerns have been raised regarding how the Project site would be remediated and the potential health and safety concerns associated with these activities. These issues are addressed in Section 3.0, Project Description, and Section 4.5, Hazards and Hazardous Materials.
- **Housing.** Questions were raised regarding the type of housing to be provided as a part of the Project. Specifically, a question was asked as to whether affordable housing would be provided and if so, where it was planned on the Project site. This issue is addressed in Section 3.0, Project Description, and Section 4.7, Population, Housing, and Employment.
- **Cultural Resources.** During the scoping process, requests were made to address Native American cultural resources in the EIR. The need for tribal input was requested by individuals and representatives of Native American tribes. This issue is addressed in Section 4.13, Cultural and Paleontological Resources.
- **Greenhouse Gas Emissions.** Requests were made that the EIR address the Project's impact on global climate change and the impact of climate change on the Project (both direct and indirect effects), including the potential rise in the sea level and the availability of water supply. This issue is addressed in Section 4.11, Greenhouse Gas Emissions.

- **Water Supply.** Comments were made that there are inadequate available potable water resources to serve the proposed Project. Concerns were raised that current water data is not accurate for use in the EIR. This issue is addressed in Section 4.14, Public Services and Facilities.
- **North Bluff Road.** Comments were made questioning the need to extend future North Bluff Road to 19<sup>th</sup> Street particularly because of the potential impacts associated with the road. A potential effect noted was the degradation in the recreational value of open space associated with the Project. Concerns were also raised about the proximity of proposed Bluff Road to existing residential uses, particularly the Newport Crest condominiums development and the related impacts of noise and air quality. These issues are addressed in Section 4.1, Land Use and Related Planning Programs; Section 4.8, Recreation and Trails; Section 4.9, Transportation and Circulation; Section 4.10, Air Quality; Section 4.12, Noise; and Section 7.0, Alternatives to the Proposed Project.
- **Noise.** Commenters were concerned about noise impacts associated with Project roads. Noise impacts on existing residents and recreational opportunities (e.g., Talbert Regional Park) were noted. This issue is addressed in Section 4.12, Noise.
- **Traffic.** Traffic levels associated with the proposed Project are of concern including construction traffic and traffic on currently impacted intersections. Issues noted include effects on emergency vehicles, including potential delayed response times. Whether the Project would necessitate the construction of the 19<sup>th</sup> Street Bridge over the Santa Ana River between the Cities of Costa Mesa and Huntington Beach was also raised as a concern. These issues are addressed in Section 4.9, Transportation and Circulation, and Section 4.14, Public Services and Facilities.
- **Air Quality.** It was noted that the EIR should address air quality impacts associated with the increase in vehicular traffic from the Project. This issue is addressed in Section 4.10, Air Quality.
- **Recreational Opportunities.** Comments were made regarding the adequacy of the recreational areas depicted on the Project's conceptual land use plan. The need for a public trail system was noted. These issues are addressed in Section 4.8, Recreation and Trails.
- **Public Safety.** Concerns were raised regarding the potential for increased crime rates associated with dense residential development in the eastern portion of the Project site and its effects on off-site land uses. Additionally noted were potential effects on emergency vehicles including delayed response times and adequacy of service. Further noted was public safety with respect to seismic activity. These issues are addressed in Section 4.3, Geology and Soils; Section 4.9, Transportation and Circulation; and Section 4.14, Public Services and Facilities.
- **Alternatives.** Commenters noted the need to address alternatives to the Project. Suggested alternatives include a reduced development alternative to address impacts associated with the proposed Project and an alternative that only permits new development on the currently developed areas associated with oil operations. Various alternatives are addressed in Section 7.0, Alternatives to the Proposed Project.
- **Schools.** Concerns were raised regarding potential impacts on the Newport-Mesa School District. Issues of note included additional students at currently impacted schools

and increased traffic associated with trips to schools. This issue is addressed in Section 4.9, Transportation and Circulation, and Section 4.14, Public Services and Facilities.

- **Aesthetics and Lighting.** Comments were made regarding the need to minimize lighting associated with the Project. Concerns were noted regarding potential impacts to private views from residences. These issues are addressed in Section 4.2, Aesthetics and Visual Resources.

## 2.4.2 ISSUES TO BE ADDRESSED IN THE EIR

The Project has the potential to have significant impacts on a number of environmental factors. Using the City of Newport Beach Environmental Checklist as a guide, at least one impact area of those below, which are addressed in the EIR, has been identified as having a “Potential Significant Impact”:

Aesthetics and Visual Resources	Air Quality
Biological Resources	Greenhouse Gas Emissions
Cultural Resources	Geology and Soils
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	Hydrology and Water Quality
Land Use and Planning Programs	Mineral Resources
Noise	Population, Housing, and Employment
Public Services and Facilities	Recreation and Trails
Transportation/Circulation	Utilities

Through the completion of the City’s Environmental Checklist for this proposed Project, the City has determined that the Project would not require the assessment of agricultural and timberland resources in the EIR. No portion of the Project site is covered by a Williamson Act Contract or located on land designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance according to the 2007 California Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. The Project site is not zoned for agriculture. Additionally, the Project site does not include forest resources, including timberlands. Within the topical area addressed in the EIR, there are several questions on the Environmental Checklist that are not applicable, and therefore were not addressed. These have been identified in Section 1.6.1, Summary of Effects With No Impact.

## 2.5 PROJECT SPONSORS AND CONTACT PERSONS

The City of Newport Beach is the Lead Agency for preparation of this EIR. Inquiries regarding the EIR should be directed to the City. The Project Applicant is Newport Banning Ranch LLC.

Lead Agency: City of Newport Beach  
Community Development Department  
3300 Newport Boulevard  
P.O. Box 1768  
Newport Beach, California 92658-8915  
Contact: Patrick Alford, Planning Manager  
(949) 644-3235  
palford@newportbeachca.gov

## 2.6 DRAFT EIR REVIEW

This Draft EIR has been distributed to responsible and trustee agencies, other affected agencies, surrounding jurisdictions, interested parties, and other parties who requested a copy in accordance with Section 21092 of the CEQA Statutes. The Notice of Completion for the Draft EIR has also been distributed as required by CEQA. Reviewers of the Draft EIR are given a 60-day review period to prepare written comments on the draft document. During the public review period, this Draft EIR (including the technical appendices) is available for review at the City of Newport Beach Community Development Department located at 3300 Newport Boulevard, Newport Beach, California. Additionally, copies of the Draft EIR and technical appendices (the later on CDs) are available at the reference desk of the following libraries and on the City's website. The Draft EIR and technical appendices can also be accessed at the City's website: <http://www.newportbeachca.gov>.

Balboa Branch  
100 East Balboa Boulevard  
Newport Beach, CA 92661

Central Branch  
1000 Avocado Avenue  
Newport Beach, CA 92660

Mariners Branch  
1300 Irvine Avenue  
Newport Beach, CA 92660

Corona del Mar Branch  
420 Marigold Avenue  
Corona del Mar, CA 92625

Written comments regarding the Draft EIR should be addressed to Patrick Alford at the address or email address provided above. Upon completion of the public review period, the City will prepare written responses to all significant environmental issues that were raised in written and oral comments on the Draft EIR and will provide these responses to commenting agencies and other parties prior to final action on the Project. These environmental comments and their responses will be included in the Final EIR as part of the environmental record for the decision makers to consider prior to certification of the EIR as final and complete.