SECTION 1.0
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 GENERAL INTRODUCTION

The environmental impact report (EIR) process, as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970 (CEQA) (Public Resources Code 21000 *et. seq*.) as amended, requires the preparation of an objective, full-disclosure document to: a) inform agency decision makers and the general public of the direct and indirect environmental effects of a proposed action; b) identify, where feasible, mitigation measures to reduce or eliminate any identified significant adverse impacts; and, c) identify and evaluate alternatives to the proposed project which might lessen or avoid some or all of the identified significant impacts of the project.

This EIR has been prepared to address the potential environmental impacts associated with an amendment of the term and conditions of the Stipulation of Settling Parties that was approved by the Honorable Terry J. Hatter and that resolved the litigation entitled *County of Orange vs. Air Cal* (USDC Case No. CV85-1542 TJH (MCX) (Settlement Agreement 1985). In conformance with CEQA, this EIR identifies and assesses the potential individual and cumulative impacts of the proposed project. The County of Orange has decided to prepare a Program EIR prepared pursuant to Section 15168 of the CEQA Guidelines. Section 15168 of the CEQA Guidelines states that a Program EIR "…may be prepared on a series of actions that can be characterized as one large project."

The County of Orange is the project proponent and lead agency. The County of Orange is the proprietor of John Wayne Airport (JWA) and a party to the Settlement Agreement.[1] The City of Newport Beach is a responsible agency and would also be required to take action on the extension of the Settlement Agreement. This Program EIR is intended to evaluate the potential impacts that could result from an amendment to the Settlement Agreement assuming three different scenarios which are referred to in the document as Scenarios 1, 2, and 3, respectively. Each scenario proposes different levels of air operations, passenger levels, and facilities improvements. The Program EIR evaluates the reasonably foreseeable impacts associated with each scenario, but is not intended to be a construction level document.

1.2 HISTORY AND BACKGROUND

JWA is owned and operated by the County of Orange and is currently the only commercial service airport in Orange County. It is located immediately adjacent to and south of Interstate 405 (I-405) and east of State Route 55 (SR-55). The property currently encompasses approximately 504 acres of land including the airfield, terminal, surface level and parking structures, administrative building, and a portion of the Newport Beach Golf Course.

Airport services in Orange County started in the early 1920s at a small airfield known as Martin's Airport. The airfield was situated on 60 acres of Irvine Ranch land approximately one mile north of where John Wayne Airport is located today.

In 1939, the County Board of Supervisors made plans to extend South Main to Corona del Mar across the Irvine Ranch and Martin's Airport. To accommodate the roadway, the airport needed to be relocated. The Irvine Company donated the land to the County for the road extension and a new airport in exchange for an exclusive long-term lease for Martin Aviation at the new airport location. The new Orange County Airport was completed in September 1941 at which time the airport consisted of a 2,500-foot paved runway with lights and a federal airways beacon. The

[1] John Wayne Airport is also known as Orange County Airport. The call letters for the airport are SNA.

County provided an administration building and one hangar. Martin Aviation provided a second hangar for their use.

In December 1941, during World War II, the U.S. Army Air Corps took over operation of the airport. The airfield was enlarged and improved for use as a fighter base. When the Army's improvements were completed, the airport had a 4,800-foot runway, full runway lighting, and a control tower atop its existing administration building.

Three years following the end of hostilities (1948), the federal government returned the airfield to the County under the condition that the property be operated as a public airport and that it be available to all types and classes of aeronautical uses. Because of this condition, the County was forced to cancel Martin Aviation's exclusive lease.

By 1948, new fixed base operators (FBOs) had begun moving into the airport. These FBOs included the Martin School of Aviation; Ben Sprague's Repair Service and Sales Agency; the Don Hillman Air Taxi Service; and the Aerodusters cropdusting firm, as well as a few other rental, repair service and sales agencies. In 1952, Bonanza Airlines began the first regular scheduled commercial air service from Orange County to points in Southern California and Arizona.

The airport underwent a period of slow expansion for the next few years during which civil air traffic was sufficiently infrequent that an unused taxiway on the field's west side became a weekend drag strip. The use of the taxiway as a drag strip was discontinued in 1958 when additional aircraft tie-down space was needed.

In 1963, the Orange County Board of Supervisors adopted the first master plan for the development of JWA. Major recommendations of this plan were the reorientation of the runway to reduce flights over the Costa Mesa area, and the addition of a shorter runway for smaller aircraft. The implementation of these recommendations resulted in the runway configuration that exists today. In addition to the runway modifications, the old administration/control tower was demolished and replaced with a new Federal Aviation Administration tower located at the west end of the airfield. The revamped airport opened its runways to traffic in 1965, serving more than 45,000 passengers annually.

It was soon apparent that the airfield would need a new terminal building to accommodate the growing number of passengers. In 1967, a new terminal building was constructed that could handle 400,000 annual passengers. By 1968, the new terminal building was handling nearly 750,000 annual passengers, almost double its design capacity.

In 1985, over 3.2 million passengers were served at JWA. In a response to the need for additional airline service in the County, the Orange County Board of Supervisors approved a Master Plan for facility improvements (February 1985), an airline access plan, and an associated Land Use Compatibility Plan. The 1985 Master Plan allowed for the construction of the existing terminal facilities. In 1990, the new 337,900-square foot Thomas F. Riley Terminal opened to the public. The terminal is served by a two-level circulating roadway system, three parking structures, and off-airport parking lots.

As part of its ongoing effort to operate JWA in a manner sensitive to the residents who live under the approach and departure corridors, the County of Orange has, developed one of the most stringent access and noise abatement programs in the country. The Airport monitors all aircraft operations, both commercial and private, for compliance with the program. Some of the more significant noise abatement and access restrictions are embodied in the Settlement Agreement, as well as ordinances, resolutions (including Resolutions No. 85-255, 85-256, 85-

259, 85-1231, 85-1232 and 85-1233), plans (including the Phase 2 Access Plan) and policies of the County. Additional detail on the regulatory history of JWA is provided in Section 2.2.

Previous Environmental Documents

JWA, and the appropriate level of commercial air at the airport, has been the subject of several environmental documents over the past 20 years. The following provides an overview of the most recent documents that evaluated JWA air service.

Environmental Impact Report 508 and Environmental Impact Statement

In 1985 the Orange County Board of Supervisors certified EIR 508 for the JWA Master Plan and Santa Ana Heights Land Use Compatibility Program. The document addressed the environmental impacts associated with an increase in air carrier operations at JWA. The project evaluated an increase from 41 Average Daily Departures (ADD) to 73 ADD, serving an estimated 10.2 Million Annual Passengers (MAP).[2] The Master Plan provided for new facilities to accommodate the increased number of ADD and MAP. The facilities in the Master Plan included, but was not limited to, a new terminal building, parking structures, circulation improvements, and fuel farms. The Settlement Agreement resolved litigation associated with the implementation of the Master Plan. It was based on this documentation that the improvements at JWA were constructed. The new terminal and facilities opened in 1990.

Environmental Impact Report 546

This EIR was prepared to evaluate various modifications to previously adopted maximum permitted noise levels at JWA to accommodate FAA actions affecting the use of noise abatement departure procedures at JWA. Eventually FAA incorporated its regulatory actions into FAA Advisory Circular (AC) 91-53A.

Environmental Impact Report 552

EIR 552 was prepared in 1994 to address the introduction of air cargo operations at JWA. United Parcel Service (UPS) and Federal Express had requested authorization to fly regularly scheduled commercial cargo service at JWA. Using the type of aircraft proposed (a Boeing 757-200 and a Airbus 320) would require the allocation of a Class A ADD. The EIR evaluated the potential environmental impacts associated with modification of the JWA Phase 2 Access Plan to allow air cargo operations. The project evaluated a range of alternatives. Based on EIR 552, the Phase 2 Access Plan and the Settlement Agreement were amended to allow commercial cargo operators and provide two additional ADD for air cargo operations and modifications to the provisions.

Environmental Impact Report 573

The County of Orange prepared EIR 573 for the *Airport System Master Plan for John Wayne Airport and Proposed Orange County International Airport*. The document addresses the potential impacts associated with the development of an airport system in Orange County. The Airport System Master Plan (ASMP) would include commercial air service at both JWA and a

[2] The ADDs at JWA are divided into three "classes" based on the noise characteristics of the aircraft on departure. The Class A flights are the noisiest. The next quietest class of ADDs is designated as Class AA. The quietest class is the Class E. The Class E flights do not have a maximum number of flights allowed because they are below the regulatory noise levels established in the EIR 508 (86.0 dB SENEL). However, the number of passengers on Class E flights does count toward the maximum 8.4 MAP allowed by the Settlement Agreement at the JWA prior to December 31, 2005. More detailed information on the allowed noise level at each noise monitoring station for the various classes of aircraft is provided in Appendix A.

proposed international airport at the decommissioned Marine Corps Air Station El Toro. EIR 573 analyzes a series of alternatives to the proposed ASMP, including two alternatives which assume that JWA would be further developed and that the El Toro site would be devoted to some use other than aviation (Alternatives "F" and "G"). The ASMP is a project distinct from this project (i.e., extension of the existing Settlement Agreement). The project being analyzed pursuant to this EIR is not inconsistent with the ASMP, EIR 573 or any of the EIR 573 alternatives, nor does the ASMP or any analysis in EIR 573 depend upon or preclude consideration of the Settlement Agreement extension project for JWA. On October 23, 2001, the Board of Supervisors certified Final EIR 573 and approved the ASMP for El Toro and JWA.

1.3 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

In the summer of 1985, the County of Orange, the City of Newport Beach, Stop Polluting Our Newport (SPON), and Airport Working Group (AWG) entered into the Settlement Agreement settling all pending actions and claims related to the 1985 Master Plan and EIR 508 and the pending appeal in the 1981 Master Plan/EIR 232 litigation. The Settlement Agreement required certain modifications to various mitigation measures originally adopted by the County at the time it certified EIR 508. The principal terms of the existing Settlement Agreement relate to restrictions and limitations on aircraft operations and commercial passenger facilities. One key component of the Settlement Agreement pertains to the number of regulated flights allowed to fly from JWA. Pursuant to the Settlement Agreement, the County may not permit or allocate to commercial air carriers more than 39 annual ADDs by Class A aircraft and not more than 73 ADD of Class A and Class AA aircraft, from JWA through December 31, 2005. Additionally, the annual number of passengers served at JWA may not exceed 8.4 MAP prior to December 31, 2005. The restrictions and limitations of the Settlement Agreement are more fully discussed in Section 2.2, while the entire Settlement Agreement is reproduced in Appendix B of this EIR. The settling parties have executed various stipulations making minor modifications to the Settlement Agreement subsequent to 1985, and copies of those stipulations are contained in Appendix C.

The Project proposes modifications of some of the provisions, including an extension of the term, of the Settlement Agreement. This EIR evaluates three "project" scenarios, each with different levels of air service and facilities improvements. The three scenarios reflect negotiations that the County and the City have conducted regarding a possible extension of the Settlement Agreement, and, in that respect, define the terms of any extension of the agreement proposed or acceptable to at least one of the parties. In order to permit the elected officials of the County and the City to determine the final terms of any extension agreement, the three project scenarios are evaluated to an equivalent level detailed in this EIR.

With each of the three scenarios, modifications to the terms of the Settlement Agreement are proposed prior to December 31, 2005. Prior to implementation of these modifications, agreement by the County and the City of Newport Beach, AWG, and SPON would be required. A more detailed description of each of the three scenarios is presented in Section 2.4. Table 1-1 below provides a brief summary of the key elements of each scenario.

1.4 ALTERNATIVES EVALUATED

In accordance with Section 15126(d) of the CEQA Guidelines, Section 4.0 of the EIR includes an alternatives discussion. In addition to the three project scenarios analyzed in Section 3.0 of the EIR, three additional alternatives are evaluated. These alternatives are the No Project Alternative, Alternative D, and Alternative E.

CEQA requires that the definition of the No Project Alternative include the existing conditions, as well as what would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future, if the project

were not approved. Specifically, Section 15126(e)(3)(A) addresses the definition of the No Project Alternative for land use or regulatory plans. It states: *"When a project is the revision of an existing land use or regulatory plan, policy or ongoing operation, the "no project" alternative will be the continuation of the existing plan, policy or operation into the future. Typically this is a situation where other projects initiated under the existing plan will continue while the new plan is developed. Thus the projected impacts of the proposed plan or alternative plans would be compared to the impacts that would occur under the existing plan."* Based on this guidance, the No Project Alternative assumes the continued implementation of all existing terms of the Settlement Agreement beyond December 31, 2005.

TABLE 1-1
OVERVIEW OF PROJECT SCENARIOS AND ALTERNATIVES

Principal Restrictions and Constraints	No Project Alternative	Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3	Alternative D	Alternative E
Curfew	No change	No change	No change	No change	No change	No change
Noise Regulated Passenger Flights	73	85 as of 1/1/2005	85 as of 4/1/2002	85 as of 4/1/2002 and 100 as of 1/1/2006	No restrictions as of 1/1/2006	79 as of 1/1/2005
Annual Passenger Limit	8.4 MAP	9.8 MAP	10.8 MAP as of 4/1/2002	No restrictions as of 4/1/2002	No restrictions as of 4/1/2006	8.8 MAP
Cargo Flights	2	2	4 as of 1/1/2006	4 as of 1/1/2006	No restrictions as of 1/1/2006	2
Passenger Loading Bridge (Gate) Limits	14	18 as of 1/1/2005	18 as of 4/1/2002	18 as of 4/1/2002 and 24 as of 1/1/2006	No restrictions as of 1/1/2006	16
Settlement Agreement Extended to	N/A	12/31/2015	12/31/2010	12/31/2015	Not applicable	12/31/2015
GA Facilities	No restrictions	No change until 1/1/2021	No restrictions	No restrictions	No restrictions	No change until 1/1/2021
GANO	No change	No change	No change	No change	No change	No change
Master Planning	No restrictions	Not permitted until 1/1/2016	No restrictions	No restrictions	No restrictions	Not permitted until 1/1/2016

The following is a brief summary of the three alternatives.

- No Project Alternative -- The No Project Alternative assumes the continuation of the provisions in Final EIR 508 and the Settlement Agreement. The Access Plan adopted for JWA provides for the 73 regulated ADD. It is assumed that the number of passengers served at JWA would increase from the 7.8 MAP served in the year 2000 to the 8.4 MAP permitted in the Settlement Agreement. The increase in the number of passengers is accomplished through additional Class E flights and a projected increase in the average load factor at JWA from recent historical levels of 0.63 to 0.66.[3] The increase in the load factor is reflective of the historic trend. This alternative would have less of an impact than any of the scenarios addressed as part of this project. Significant unavoidable adverse impacts would include traffic and air quality impacts.

[3] The load factor is a ratio computed by determining the number of passengers actually on the aircraft at the time of departure divided by the number of seats available on the aircraft. The load factor cited for JWA is an average of all commercial flights departing JWA in the Access Plan year. The Access Plan year starts on April 1st and continues to March 31st.

- Alternative D -- This alternative would not extend the Settlement Agreement. The restrictions and limitations outlined in the Settlement Agreement would remain in place until December 31, 2005, but would then be eliminated and operations at JWA would be unconstrained by the Settlement Agreement limitations. There would be no restrictions on the number of regulated flights, the MAP served at JWA, or on the size or development of facilities. As with all the scenarios and alternatives, it is assumed that the County of Orange would not change the curfew, in place since 1969, or the maximum permitted single noise event ("Class A") and curfew provisions of the General Aviation Noise Ordinance (GANO) because these are adopted by ordinance and the County is not presently contemplating any modifications to those restrictions. The number of flights and passengers served at the airport reflects JWA operating at runway capacity during peak hours.[4] This alternative would allow approximately 181 ADD of Class A aircraft and accommodate 13.9 MAP. This alternative would have greater environmental impacts than any of the scenarios addressed in the EIR. This alternative would have significant unavoidable land use, traffic, noise, and air quality impacts.

- Alternative E -- This alternative would extend the Settlement Agreement and would permit the construction of two additional gates, an increase in noise regulated ADD from 73 to 79, and an increase in passenger service level to 8.8 MAP. This alternative assumes no change to the curfew, the single event noise limit, or the GANO. This alternative assumes that all noise-regulated departures would be operated by Class A aircraft. This alternative would provide only a small increase in the number of ADD and MAP compared to either existing conditions or the No Project Alternative.

1.5 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

CEQA requires that the EIR identify the environmentally superior alternative. The No Project Alternative is the environmental superior alternative. Section 15126.6 states "if the environmentally superior alternative is the 'no project' alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives." Taking that into consideration and based on a review of the scenarios and alternatives addressed in the EIR, Alternative E is the environmentally superior alternative. Scenario 1 most effectively meets the project objectives, with only minor incremental increases in project impacts. This is discussed more fully in Section 4.5.

1.6 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY

JWA, and air travel in general, has historically been an area of controversy in Orange County. Litigation and community discourse over the noise and traffic associated with commercial air service at JWA has been an issue since the 1970s. The Settlement Agreement reduced the intensity of this controversy because it established operational parameters at the airport that safeguarded the concerns of the community and allowed for needed improvements to be implemented without fear of litigation or political opposition. Having been in place for 16 years, the Settlement Agreement removed from discussion what level of air service should be provided at JWA and the appropriate restrictions at the airport, at least until the end of 2005. The consideration of extending the Settlement Agreement involves balancing competing interests-the same interests that were addressed through the Settlement Agreement. There is a need to balance the overall demand for air travel in Orange County with the potential impacts on the surrounding areas. Many communities that are within close proximity to the airport would like to

[4] Based on control tower counts and videotapes, the operations at JWA are currently at 64 percent of capacity during the peak period from 7:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m. The theoretical capacity of the runways is 55 operations per hour.

see no increase in the number of regulated flights or passengers being served at JWA. Others, many not directly affected by airport operations, would like to see the amount of service at the airport increased so that a larger percentage of Orange County's air demand may be served at the existing facility.

Because of physical constraints and limited area within its current boundaries, JWA is not able to serve all of the Orange County air travel demand. There is controversy regarding the appropriate amount of air travel that needs to be accommodated within Orange County. The excess demand not being served in Orange County is required to use other regional airports.

1.7 ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED

The principal issue to be resolved by the County in connection with the selection and adoption of a project under this EIR is the determination of the appropriate point of balance between the need of the County for adequate air transportation services to support its economy, and the environmental interests and concerns of local residents. This has been the basic policy issue inherent in consideration of any and all access or operational limits at JWA; and it remains the basic policy issue in respect of the decision presented by the proposed project to the Orange County Board of Supervisors. It is, of course, also an issue for the City of Newport Beach and other interested parties, although the principal objective of the City, understandably, is protection of what the City believes to be the environmental interests of its residents.

1.8 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The study area is generally urban in character. Extensively developed industrial and commercial land uses abut the airport to the north, east, and west and lower density residential and open space land uses are located to the south and southwest. An extensive arterial highway and freeway system surrounds the airport providing access from several locations to the airport. In contrast to the urban development surrounding the airport, the Upper Newport Bay, located approximately 3,600 feet south of the airport, is an important natural area, providing habitat to many wildlife species.

1.9 EIR FOCUS AND EFFECTS FOUND NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT

In accordance with Section 15063 of the State CEQA Guidelines, the County of Orange prepared an Initial Study/Environmental Checklist for the proposed project and distributed it along with the Notice of Preparation (NOP) to responsible and interested agencies, and key interest groups. The NOP was distributed to 252 individuals or agencies for a 30-day review period beginning on August 14, 2001.

A total of 18 comment letters were received. The primary concerns outlined in the letters are as follows:

- Governor's Office of Planning and Research -- The State Clearinghouse distributed the document to 12 state agencies and commissions, including: The Resource Agency, Department of Conservation, California Coastal Commission, Department of Fish and Game, Native American Heritage Commission, State Lands Commission, California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)--District 12, Caltrans--Division of Aeronautics, California Highway Patrol, Air Resources Board-Airport Projects, and the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board.

- City of La Palma -- The City expressed no immediate concerns associated with the project.

- City of Anaheim -- The City had no comment at this time.

- Avis -- Avis expressed an interest in growth in airport business balanced with the needs and priorities of the surrounding community.

- South Coast Air Quality Management District -- The District stated that air quality analysis should address the impacts associated with all phases of the project and all air pollutant sources.

- City of Seal Beach -- The City had no comment at this time.

- Grant Younglove – Mr. Younglove expressed concern regarding increased activity at JWA and support for the development of El Toro.

- Ed Burlingham – Mr. Burlingham raised concerns pertaining to noise impacts associated with any increase in the number of flights from JWA.

- Margaret Morgan – Ms. Morgan raised specific questions pertaining to noise, fuel delivery systems, land use and planning, transportation/circulation, biological resources, and hazards.

- Ralph P. Morgan, Jr. – Mr. Morgan provided comments pertaining to noise and pollution impacts associated with JWA.

- City of Aliso Viejo – The City requested that cumulative impacts and the impacts associated with the diversion of aircraft to other regional airports be evaluated.

- City of Irvine – The City requested that the EIR include a health risk assessment, an analysis of demand for parking, and an alternative for providing bus service to other regional airports for long-range and international flights.

- Thomas S. Anderson – Mr. Anderson expressed concern about noise impacts on sensitive land uses that would occur with an increased number of flights from JWA. Safety impacts, specifically regarding schools, were an additional impact identified. Information on the location of schools and daycare facilities was provided.

- City of Rancho Santa Margarita -- The City does not have specific comments at this time, but would appreciate receiving documents and meeting notices.

- City of Orange -- The City requested that any increased noise associated with flights over the City sensitive land uses be evaluated in the EIR.

- City Managers for the Cities of Anaheim, Costa Mesa, Newport Beach, Orange, Santa Ana, and Tustin – The managers expressed a commitment to preserving the operational restrictions at JWA.

- City of Tustin -- The City may have concerns related to environmental impacts. These concerns will be transmitted as part of the City's review of the Draft Environmental Impact Report.

- Caltrans-District 12 – Caltrans requested that a traffic study be prepared that addresses increased traffic volumes, and the impacts on local and regional transportation systems.

Copies of the NOP/Initial Study, distribution list, and NOP responses are included in Appendix D. The Initial Study determined that an EIR is required to evaluate the potentially significant environmental effects on the proposed project. The EIR addresses all the potential significant effects identified in the environmental checklist. In addition, the EIR provides a discussion of other issues that were determined not to be significant but will assist the reader in developing a better understanding of the project and the environment in which it would be implemented. In accordance with Section 15128 of the State CEQA Guidelines, the following items were checked "No Impact" or "Less Than Significant Impact," and do not warrant further evaluation in the EIR:

- Agriculture -- The proposed project would not result in any impacts to farmlands listed as Prime, Unique, or of "Statewide Importance" based on the 1997 Natural Resource Conservation Service Mapping. The study area is completely urbanized and no farmland exists in proximity to the project. No part of the project site or adjacent areas are subject to the Williamson Act. The project would not result in pressures to convert farmlands to other uses.

- Population and Housing -- The project study area is located within the highly urbanized portion of Orange County. The project would not result in the local or regional population projections being exceeded. The project does not propose any development that would increase the population in the study area or within Orange County. No housing would be built or removed as a result of the proposed project.

- Geophysical -- As with development in most of Orange County, geotechnical issues pose a potential constraint to development; however, through standard design and engineering practices the potential impacts can be mitigated. Specific design for a proposed construction project is required to fully address these specific concerns. Because no specific facilities improvements or approvals are part of the proposed project, these issues are more appropriately evaluated at the time a specific construction proposal is made, if ever, and the necessary construction level documentation is prepared.

- Hydrology and Drainage -- Improvements constructed at the airport, including a peaking basin has resulted in the removal of the aviation portion of the airport from being flood-prone. The project would not substantially alter the drainage patterns.

- Safety hazards due to design features, inadequate emergency access, hazards or barrier to pedestrians and bicyclists, impacts to rail, waterborne, or air traffic -- The project would be designed to adopted standards to minimize any design safety hazards. The project design would not inhibit or otherwise impede emergency access that is currently provided on site. Project improvements are predominately onsite; therefore, emergency access to off-site areas would not be affected by the project. Existing pedestrian walkways and bikeways would not be affected by the project.

- Light and Glare -- JWA is surrounded by office/commercial uses to the west and east and framed by major arterial highways and freeways. Views of the airport are primarily from the street and freeway system that surrounds the airport. Residential and recreation uses south of the airport do not have direct views of the airport due to

elevation differences and intervening uses. Lighting for the terminal, parking structure and parking lot provide adequate lighting for operation. To comply with federal rules and regulations pertaining to minimizing glare and shielding lighting from pilots, JWA uses surface materials to reduce glare effects. There is minimal spill over lighting to offsite uses. Additionally, no sensitive uses are immediately adjacent to the airport.

- Cultural Resources -- A records search determined that there are no recorded prehistoric archaeological sites, historic sites, or California Historical Landmarks within the project study area. The airport site has been heavily disturbed due to construction activities; therefore, no cultural resources would be expected on site.

- Recreation -- The project would not generate any increase in population or provide development that would result in increased usage of existing neighborhood and regional parks. There would not be any substantial physical deterioration to existing recreation facilities due to the project. Potential impacts associated with increased noise on recreational facilities are addressed as part of the noise evaluation in Section 3.3.

- Mineral Resources -- According to the County of Orange General Plan Resources Element, the project study area does not have significant existing and potential mineral or energy resources within its boundaries. The California Division of Mines and Geology also supports this finding.

- Schools -- The project would not result in the development of any residential units; therefore, the project would not generate any additional students. The project would not have any direct impact on school facilities. Potential noise impacts are discussed in Section 3.3.

- Other Government Services -- The expansion of the airport terminal would result in increased maintenance responsibilities for the County of Orange. These services are generally contracted out and paid for by the airport using airport funds. The cost associated with the increased maintenance would be provided by the increased revenue associated with the higher level of service at the airport.

1.10 ORGANIZATION OF THE EIR

This document has been divided into 12 chapters and is bound in two volumes. The first chapter is a summary chapter that provides an overview of the project and potential environmental impacts. Chapter 2 provides the project description of the three scenarios being evaluated at an equal level of detail. Chapter 2 also outlines the project objectives and intended uses of the EIR. Chapter 3 provides the environmental setting, impacts, and mitigation measures associated with 11 topical areas. For each topical area, the thresholds for determining the significance of an impact have been identified. Chapter 4 provides an alternatives analysis. Chapter 5 discusses the potential cumulative impacts associated with the project. Chapter 6 evaluates the long-term implications of the project, including growth-inducing impacts. Chapter 7 summarizes the significant, unavoidable, adverse impacts associated with each project scenario. All the mitigation measures identified in the EIR are compiled in Chapter 8 to facilitate a review of the measures proposed for adoption as part of this project. Chapter 9 lists the persons and organizations consulted, and Chapter 10 lists the preparers and contributors to the document. The references used in preparing the document are contained in Chapter 11. A glossary of terms is provided in Chapter 12.

As previously indicated, the document is presented in two volumes. The second volume contains the technical appendices. The technical appendices include technical studies prepared for the project, the NOP, the Settlement Agreement, and related documents.

1.11 REFERENCED DOCUMENTS, AND AVAILABILITY OF STUDIES AND REPORTS

Copies of this Draft EIR, the technical appendices, and cited or referenced studies or reports are available for review at the JWA Administrative Offices. Additionally, copies the EIR and technical appendices are available for review at the main offices of the City of Newport Beach. The appropriate addresses are located below:

John Wayne Airport
Administrative Office
3160 Airway Avenue
Costa Mesa, California 92626
Contact David Helmreich

City of Newport Beach
Planning Department
3300 Newport Boulevard
Newport Beach, California 92658
Contact Patrick Alford

In addition, the EIR and technical appendices are available at the following libraries:

Aliso Viejo
1 Journey
Aliso Viejo CA 92656

Anaheim
500 West Broadway
Anaheim CA 92805

Brea
1 Civic Center Circle
Brea CA 92821

Costa Mesa
1855 Park Avenue
Costa Mesa CA 92627

Costa Mesa/Mesa Verde
2969 Mesa Verde Drive East
Costa Mesa CA 92626

Cypress
5331 Orange Avenue
Cypress CA 90630

Dana Point
33841 Niguel Road
Dana Point CA 92629

El Toro
24672 Raymond Way
Lake Forest CA 92630

Fountain Valley
17635 Los Alamos
Fountain Valley CA 92708

Westminster
8180 13th Street
Westminster CA 92683

Garden Grove/Chapman
9182 Chapman Avenue
Garden Grove CA 92841

Garden Grove Regional
11200 Stanford Avenue
Garden Grove CA 92840

Garden Grove/West
11962 Bailey Avenue
Garden Grove Ca 92845

Irvine/Heritage Park Regional
14361 Yale Avenue
Irvine CA 92604

Irvine/University Park
4512 Sandburg Way
Irvine CA 92612

La Habra
221 East La Habra Boulevard
La Habra CA 90631

La Palma
7842 Walker
La Palma CA 90623

Laguna Beach
363 Glenneyre
Laguna Beach CA 92651

Laguna Niguel
30341 Crown Valley Parkway
Laguna Niguel CA 92677

Los Alamitos/Rossmoor
12700 Montecito
Seal Beach CA 90740

Newport Beach
1000 Avocado Avenue
Newport Beach CA 92660

Orange
101 North Center Street
Orange CA 92865

Rancho Santa Margarita
30902 La Promesa
Rancho Santa Margarita CA 92688

San Clemente
242 Avenida Del Mar
San Clemente CA 92672

San Juan Capistrano Regional
31495 El Camino Real
San Juan Capistrano CA 92675

Seal Beach
707 Electric Avenue
Seal Beach CA 90740

Silverado
28192 Silverado Canyon Road
Silverado

Stanton
7850 Katella Avenue
Stanton CA 90680

Tustin
345 East Main Street
Tustin CA 92780

Villa Park
17865 Santiago Boulevard
Villa Park CA 92861

1.12 SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES THAT WOULD REDUCE OR AVOID THAT EFFECT

Table 1-2 presents a summary of the potential environmental effects of the Proposed Project; measures to mitigate project impacts to the extent feasible, and expected status of effects following the implementation of the mitigation measures. The more detailed evaluation of these issues is presented in Section 3. If the text of the mitigation measure is too lengthy to include in tabular format, it is briefly summarized in the table and the mitigation measure number is noted. All mitigation measures are listed in their entirety in the appropriate portion of Section 3 and in Section 8. In Table 1-2, the significance of each impact is indicated by the following abbreviations that parenthetically follow the summary description of the effect: S=significant impact; LS= impact is less than significant according to the State CEQA Guidelines; and NI=no impact.

TABLE 1-2
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES AND LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

IMPACT			MITIGATION MEASURE	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
Scenario 1	**Scenario 2**	**Scenario 3**		
LAND USE AND OTHER RELEVANT PLANNING (SECTION 3.1)				
Scenario 1 would not result in any additional residential land in a greater that 65 CNEL contour. (LS)	Scenario 2 would result in an additional 0.03 square mile of residential land within the 65 to 70 CNEL. The increase in the 65 CNEL in areas with noise sensitive land use would be greater than 1.5 dB. The increased noise levels would be incompatible with these residential uses. (SI)	Scenario 3 would result in an additional 0.05 square mile of residential land within the 65 to 70 CNEL. The increase in the 65 CNEL in areas with noise sensitive land use would be greater than 1.5 dB. The increased noise levels would be incompatible with these residential uses. (SI)	*SCENARIO 1* – No mitigation is required. *SCENARIOS 2 and 3* – Section 3.3 of this EIR provides mitigation measures for noise impacts; however, exceeding outdoor noise standards would still be considered significant. No other mitigation pertaining to land uses are proposed.	*SCENARIO 1* – No significant impacts would occur. *SCENARIOS 2 and 3* –Noise-related land use impacts would be considered significant.
TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION (Section 3.2)				
Increased trip generation would result in a significant impact to the Campus/North Bristol intersection. (S) The following four freeway ramps would be impacted: I-405 at MacArthur Northbound On-Ramp; I-405 at MacArthur Southbound On-Ramp; I-405 at MacArthur Northbound Off-Ramp; SR-73 at Campus/ Irvine Northbound On-Ramp. (S) No freeway mainline segments would be significantly impacted. (LS)	Increased trip generation would result in a significant impact to the Campus/North Bristol intersection. (S) The four freeway ramps impacted under Scenario 1 would also be significantly impacted under this scenario. (S) The following freeway mainline segments would be significantly impacted: SR-55 Northbound, north of I-405, SR-55 Southbound, north of I-405. (S)	Increased trip generation would result in a significant impact to the Campus/North Bristol and Irvine/Mesa intersections. (S) The freeway ramps impacted under Scenario 1 would also be impacted under Scenario 3. Additionally, the SR-73 Southbound On-Ramp at Campus/Irvine would be impacted. (S) The freeway mainline segments impacted under Scenario 2 would also be impacted under Scenario 3. (S)	*SCENARIOS 1, 2 and 3* – Mitigation measures T-1 and T-2, and committed improvements identified in Section 3.2.5 are proposed. These roadway improvements include lane additions at affected intersections and freeway ramps (refer to Table 3.2-14).	*SCENARIOS 1, 2 and 3* – Impacts would be reduced to levels considered less than significant after mitigation; however, there is not current funding for the improvements. The freeway improvements are within Caltrans juris-diction. The improvements are not currently programmed and the implementation by 2006 is not certain. Therefore, these impacts may remain significant.

TABLE 1-2
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES AND LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

IMPACT			MITIGATION MEASURE	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3		
NOISE (Section 3.3)				
Scenario 1 would result in a >1.5 dB increase, but only in one commercial area within the 65 CNEL contour. (LS)	Scenario 2 would result in a >1.5 dB increase in outdoor residential areas with a noise exposure greater than 65 CNEL. (S)	Scenario 3 would result in a >1.5 dB increase in outdoor residential areas with a noise exposure greater than 65 CNEL. (S)	*SCENARIO 1* – No mitigation required. *SCENARIOS 2 and 3* – There are no mitigation measures that would lessen the impact to outdoor residential areas.	*SCENARIO 1* – No significant noise impacts would occur. *SCENARIOS 2 and 3* – Noise impacts would remain significant.
AIR QUALITY (Section 3.4)				
During construction, emissions of CO, ROC, NO_x, SO_x, and PM_{10} from fugitive dust emissions may exceed SCAQMD thresholds. (S) CO and NO_x emissions during aircraft operations would exceed SCAQMD thresholds. (S) 1-hr NO_x and 24-hr PM_{10} concentrations from vehicular emissions would exceed state standards. (S) Violation of 1-hr NO_x and 24-hr PM_{10} standards would increase, and would be inconsistent with the AQMP. (S)	During construction, emissions of CO, ROC, NO_x, SO_x, and PM_{10} from fugitive dust emissions may exceed SCAQMD thresholds. (S) CO and NO_x emissions during aircraft operations would exceed SCAQMD thresholds. (S) 1-hr NO_x and 24-hr PM_{10} concentrations from vehicular emissions would exceed state standards. (S) Violation of 1-hr NO_x and 24-hr PM_{10} standards would increase, and would be inconsistent with the AQMP. (S)	During construction, emissions of CO, ROC, NO_x, SO_x, and PM_{10} from fugitive dust emissions may exceed SCAQMD thresholds. (S) CO and NO_x emissions during aircraft operations would exceed SCAQMD thresholds. (S) 1-hr NO_x and 24-hr PM_{10} concentrations from vehicular emissions would exceed state standards. (S) Violation of 1-hr NO_x and 24-hr PM_{10} standards would increase, and would be inconsistent with the AQMP. (S)	*SCENARIOS 1, 2 and 3* – Construction emissions would be reduced with mitigation measure AQ-1, Dust Suppression. All other impacts would be reduced with mitigation measures AQ-2 through AQ-22.	*SCENARIOS 1, 2 and 3* – Impacts would be reduced, but would remain significant after mitigation.

TABLE 1-2
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES AND LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

IMPACT			MITIGATION MEASURE	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
Scenario 1	**Scenario 2**	**Scenario 3**		
WATER QUALITY (3.5)				
No impacts related to water quality would result from implementation of Scenarios 1, 2, or 3, and no mitigation is required.				
BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES (3.6)				
No impacts related to biological resources would result from implementation of Scenarios 1, 2, or 3, and no mitigation is required.				
PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES (3.7)				
No impacts related to public services and utilities would result from implementation of Scenarios 1, 2, or 3, and no mitigation is required.				
AESTHETICS (3.8)				
No impacts related to aesthetics would result from implementation of Scenarios 1, 2, or 3, and no mitigation is required.				
PUBLIC SAFETY (3.9)				
No impacts related to public safety would result from implementation of Scenarios 1, 2, or 3, and no mitigation is required.				
HAZARDOUS WASTES AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS USE (3.10)				
No impacts related to hazardous wastes and hazardous materials use would result from implementation of Scenarios 1, 2, or 3, and no mitigation is required.				
RISK OF UPSET (Section 3.11)				
The increased number of trucks transporting jet fuel to JWA along highways would incrementally increase the potential for accident; however, the likelihood is very small. (LS)	The increased number of trucks transporting jet fuel to JWA along highways would incrementally increase the potential for accident; however, the likelihood is very small. (LS)	The increased number pg trucks transporting jet fuel to JWA along highways would incrementally increase the potential for accident; however, the likelihood is very small. (LS)	*SCENARIOS 1, 2, and 3* – No mitigation required.	*SCENARIOS 1, 2, and 3* – No significant impacts would result.