
5.13 - Transportation and Traffic

5.13.1 - Introduction

Purpose

The purpose of this section is to identify the existing setting regarding transportation/traffic and potential effects from project implementation on these resources on-site. This section also identifies mitigation measures to reduce any potentially significant transportation/traffic impacts and describes the residual impact, if any, after imposition of the mitigation.

Sources

Information in this section is based on the following sources of information:

- Traffic Impact Study for the Ridgeline Equestrian Estates Project, Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc., March 23, 2009. The complete study is contained Appendix O.
- Letter from the State Department of Transportation (Caltrans) September 26, 2007. This letter is contained in Appendix A.
- Letter from the Transportation Corridor Agencies, October 3, 2007. This letter is contained in Appendix A.
- County of Orange, Resource & Development and Management Department, October 17, 2007. This letter is contained in Appendix A.
- Comments received from the public during the public review period. These comments are contained in Appendix A.
- Comments received during the public scoping meeting. These comments are contained in Appendix A.

5.13.2 - Existing On-Site Setting

There are no public rights-of-way located on the project site. A private vehicular drive aisle extends from the entrance at South Meads Avenue to the parking lot adjacent to the clubhouse and to the maintenance area. The tennis courts, swimming pool, and clubhouse are still in use as of the date the Notice of Preparation was published and work on the Draft EIR began, but the golf course and driving range ceased operations in November 2006.

Vehicular Access to Project Site

Existing vehicle access to the project site is provided only from South Meads Avenue. This intersection is not traffic controlled and operates with free-flowing traffic along South Meads Avenue.

Orange Park Boulevard

Orange Park Boulevard does not have a sidewalk along its entire length between Santiago Canyon Road and South Meads Avenue. On the west side of Orange Park Boulevard is an equestrian trail, separated from the roadway by a wood rail fence and an unpaved area between the fence and the

roadway for use by pedestrians and bikes to walk off the paved portion of the roadway. The east side of Orange Park Boulevard is either a dirt shoulder or a ditch outside the paved travel-way.

Santiago Canyon Road

Santiago Canyon Road has an equestrian trail and no paved sidewalk along the north side of the street from west of Orange Park Boulevard to east of North Meads Avenue. On the south side of Santiago Canyon Road, there is a paved sidewalk starting just west of Orange Park Boulevard and ending at North Meads Avenue. Striped crosswalks and pedestrian pushbuttons are provided only on the west side of the intersection of Santiago Canyon Road at Orange Park Boulevard, and only on the east side of the intersection of Santiago Canyon Road at North Meads Avenue.

South Meads Avenue

South Meads Avenue is a two-lane local road adjacent to the project site which provides direct access to the project property. Adjacent to the project site, South Meads Avenue is approximately 20 feet wide, with narrow dirt or gravel shoulders, and no parking on either side of the road until after 8:00 p.m. on the west side. The roadway name changes from South Meads Avenue to North Meads Avenue at Randall Street. North of Randall Street, North Meads Avenue widens on the east side of the road to allow on-street parking. An equestrian path is provided on the west side of the road. Only a portion of the trail is fenced to City standards.

Alternative Transportation

Transit

The significance of this increase is discussed below. Transit routes that serve the proposed project vicinity include Route 57 (which runs north-south on State College Boulevard/The City Drive), Route 54 (which runs east-west along Chapman Avenue), Route 454 (which runs east-west along Chapman Avenue serving The Block at Orange and the Orange Transportation Center), and Route 757 (which runs south on The City Drive and Bristol Street, east on Chapman Avenue, and north on [State Route-57] SR-57).

5.13.3 - Regulatory Setting

Federal

No federal regulations are associated with this topical environmental issue area.

State

The State Department of Transportation (Caltrans) established performance standards for all State highway facilities are the transition between LOS C and D. If a State highway facility operates below the transition between LOS C and D, the Caltrans' thresholds is to maintain the lower level of service.

Local

County of Orange

Congestion Management Program

The Orange County Congestion Management Program (CMP) administered by OCTA is a requirement of the Proposition 111 gas tax increase passed in 1990. The CMP requires that designated intersections throughout the county be maintained at a specified level of service. Guidelines with respect to CMP traffic studies require that the potential impacts at CMP intersections be analyzed for any significant land use proposals. The information in this report provides the required CMP analysis.

Growth Management Plan

The Orange County Measure M Growth Management Plan (GMP) was developed to assess and mitigate the impacts of local land use decisions on the county’s transportation system. Central to the program is the requirement that each jurisdiction in the county adopt a Growth Management Element of its General Plan to be applied in the development review process in order to receive transportation revenues generated from the Measure M half-cent sales tax increase. The GMP includes specific guidelines for traffic impact studies, establishing LOS thresholds and requirements for mitigation. The information contained in this report satisfies the requirements of those guidelines.

City of Orange

A traffic study area for the proposed project was developed based on the requirements of the City of Orange (City) Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) guidelines. A Scoping Agreement for the TIA was reviewed and approved by the City in June 2007, which determined the study area intersections. The TIA analyzed the arterial highways in the traffic study area based on the peak hour level of service (LOS) and intersection capacity utilization (ICU) methodology at the signalized intersections and the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) methodology at unsignalized intersections. Local roadway capacities were analyzed based on volume to capacity ratios.

Table 5.13-1 and Table 5.13-2 provide the level of service descriptions for signalized and unsignalized intersections.

Table 5.13-1: Level of Service Descriptions - Signalized Intersections

Level of Service	Intersection Capacity Utilization	Description
A	0.00 - 0.60	Excellent - No vehicle waits longer than one red light and no approach phase is fully used.
B	0.61 - 0.70	Very Good - An occasional approach phase is fully utilized; drivers begin to feel somewhat restricted within groups of vehicles.
C	0.71 - 0.80	Good - Occasionally drivers may have to wait through more than one red light; back-ups may develop behind turning vehicles.

Table 5.13-1 (cont): Level of Service Descriptions - Signalized Intersections

Level of Service	Intersection Capacity Utilization	Description
D	0.81 - 0.90	Fair - Delays may be substantial during portions of the rush hour, but enough lower volume periods occur to permit clearing of developing lines, preventing excessive back-ups.
E	0.91 - 1.00	Poor - Represents the most vehicles that the intersection approaches can accommodate; may be long lines of waiting vehicles through several signal cycles.
F	> 1.00	Failure - Back-ups from nearby locations or on cross streets may restrict or prevent movement of vehicles out of the intersection approaches. Tremendous delays with continuously increasing queue lengths.

Source: Traffic Impact Analysis, Kimley-Horn and Associates, March 23, 2009.

Table 5.13-2: Level of Service Descriptions - Unsignalized Intersections

Level of Service	Delay (Seconds/Vehicle)	Description
A	≤ 10.0	Little or no delay
B	> 10.0 and ≤ 15.0	Short traffic delays
C	> 15.0 and ≤ 25.0	Average traffic delays
D	> 25.0 and ≤ 35.0	Long traffic delays
E	> 35.0 and ≤ 50.0	Very long traffic delays
F	≥ 50.0	Severe congestion

Source: Traffic Impact Analysis, Kimley-Horn and Associates, March 23, 2009.

5.13.4 - Significance Thresholds

According to Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines, a project would normally have a significant effect on the environment if it would result in the following:

- a.) Cause an increase in traffic, which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections);
- b.) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways;
- c.) 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;

- d.) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment);
- e.) Result in inadequate emergency access;
- f.) Result in inadequate parking capacity, and/or;
- g.) Conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g. bus turnouts, bicycle racks).

5.13.5 - Project Impacts

Impacts Not Found To Be Significant

The Initial Study determined that no impacts were related to exceeding a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency, changes in air traffic patterns, inadequate emergency access, or conflicting with plans and policies supporting alternative transportation.

Potentially Significant Impacts

Potentially significant impacts are associated with the potential to cause a substantial increase in traffic, increased hazards, or inadequate parking capacity during the long-term operational phase. No short-term construction phase traffic impacts are anticipated. A Traffic Control Plan would be prepared and coordinated with Public Works Staff for installation of water lines in Coyote Land and Meads Avenue.

Traffic Increase

Impact 5.13-1 **The project has the potential to cause an increase in traffic, which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections).**
[CEQA Transportation and Traffic Threshold 15(a)]

Existing Vehicular Traffic at Study Area Intersections

All of the traffic study area intersections are presently operating at LOS “C” or better during the AM and PM peak hours for the existing conditions. Table 5.13-3 provides the AM Peak and PM Peak levels of service for the study area intersections. Exhibit 5.13-1 depicts the locations of the study area intersections.

Table 5.13-3: Existing Levels of Service

Intersection	Type	AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour	
		ICU Delay	LOS	ICU Delay	LOS
Santiago Canyon Road and Orange Park Boulevard	Signalized	0.652	B	0.782	C
Santiago Canyon Road and North Meads Avenue	Signalized	0.660	B	0.794	C

Table 5.13-3 (cont): Existing Levels of Service

Intersection	Type	AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour	
		ICU Delay	LOS	ICU Delay	LOS
South Meads Avenue and Project Entrance	Unsignalized	8.7 Sec	A	8.9 Sec	A
Orange Park Boulevard and South Meads Avenue	Unsignalized	7.5 Sec	A	7.8 Sec	A
Notes: ICU = intersection capacity utilization LOS = level of service Sec = seconds Source: Traffic Impact Analysis, Kimley-Horn and Associates, March 23, 2009.					

Historic Trip Generation

Traffic counts were taken at the project entrance in July 2006 when the Ridgeline Country Club was in full operation. These activities included the golf course, lighted driving range, clubhouse with gym and locker facilities, tennis facility with 14 courts, swimming pool used seasonally by local groups for swim team practice and swim meets, and a banquet and catering facility available for social events.

Table 5.13-4 is provided only to illustrate the comparison between the Ridgeline Country Club when all the activities were operating in July 2006 versus the existing conditions (August 2007 traffic counts) with the golf course and driving range not operating. The table indicates that 796 fewer trips would be generated by the Ridgeline project. These dates are provided for historic comparative purposes only and the Traffic Impact Study prepared for the Ridgeline project excluded this historic data from the analysis.

Table 5.13-4: Historic Trip Generation

Condition	Daily Trips	AM Peak Hour			PM Peak Hour		
		In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total
Historic Conditions	1,233	74	44	118	65	57	122
Proposed Project	437	9	28	37	29	17	46
Net New Traffic	-796	-65	-16	-81	-36	-40	-76
Notes: Net = difference between the existing and proposed conditions The traffic counts used for this table were taken in July 2006 when all site uses were currently operating. Source: Traffic Impact Analysis, Kimley-Horn and Associates, March 23, 2009.							

Proposed Trip Generation

Table 5.13-5 provides the trip generation of the proposed project based on the Traffic Impact Study prepared for the Ridgeline project.

Table 5.13-5: Project Trip Generation

Condition	Daily Trips	AM Peak Hour			PM Peak Hour		
		In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total
Existing Conditions	498	14	10	24	49	27	76
Proposed Project	437	9	28	37	29	17	46
Net New Traffic	-61	-5	18	13	-20	-10	-30
Notes: Net = difference between the existing and proposed conditions. The traffic counts used for the Traffic Impact Analysis were taken in August 2007 at a time when the activities related to the swimming pool were not in session. Source: Traffic Impact Analysis, Kimley-Horn and Associates, March 23, 2009.							

Compared to the existing land uses comprised of the club house, tennis courts, and swimming pool, the proposed project would be estimated to generate 61 fewer daily trips and fewer trips during the PM Peak Hour conditions. In addition, AM Peak Hour conditions would increase by only 18 trips.

The proposed project would not have a traffic-related impact that is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system. Less than significant impacts would result from project implementation and no traffic mitigation measures would be required.

Hazards

Impact 5.13-4	<p>The project has the potential to substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment).</p> <p>[CEQA Transportation and Traffic Threshold 15(d)]</p>
----------------------	--

Vehicular Access to Project Site

Vehicular access to the site would be from one main entrance on South Meads Avenue. The existing entrance to the project site would be relocated to approximately 60-feet west of the existing entrance and reconfigured to a 90-degree T-intersection to accommodate vehicles with horse trailers. A 35-foot curb return radius would be proposed with a separate right-turn lane on South Meads Avenue. Refer to Exhibit 3-15 in the Project description section. The entry drive would provide one 20-foot travel lane in each direction, to accommodate vehicles pulling horse trailers.

The development would have a emergency vehicular access point consisting of a 20-foot emergency-only Knox box access extending from Coyote Lane, and connecting to “B” Street, which would be available for fire trucks and other emergency vehicles.

The proposed project would not create potential hazards due to the design of the vehicular access to the project site. The proposed project entrance would be realigned to form a 90-degree T-intersection with South Meads Avenue and widened to accommodate vehicles with horse trailers. With this reconfiguration, any potential hazards related to ingress and egress with vehicles pulling horse trailers would result in less than significant impacts.

The Traffic Impact Analysis prepared a sight distance analysis based on City Standard No. 126 to determine if any potentially significant impacts would be associated with the vertical curve in Meads Avenue at the project entrance. City Standard No. 126 provides standards for determining a Limited Use Area, defined as the area that must be kept free of obstructions that could block a driver's view and impair the sight distance.

Sight distance to the west (looking left) exceeds the minimum distance of 280 feet requirement by approximately 45 feet. Sight distance to the east (looking right) is approximately 10 feet short of the required distance of 280 feet. Based on field observations by Kimley-Horn, the 270-foot sight distance to east was determined not to be a safety issue. No obstructions exist within the Limited Use Area and landscape maintenance of proposed vegetation would not result in blocking a driver's view. In addition to the field analysis performed by Kimley-Horn, Hunsaker and Associates calculated the sight distance in relation to the project entrance and determined that no obstructions exist from either direction. Exhibits 5.13-2 through 5.13-5 provide graphical depictions of the sight distance based on City Public Works Standard No. 126. Therefore, less than significant impacts to sight distance would result from project implementation related to the City's sight distance standard at the project entrance.

Internal Circulation

The proposed internal roadway system are designed with three specific goals: rural feel and character, water quality, and equestrian trail access. The proposed roadways are loosely based on the City's Standard Plans No. 108 (Standard Private Streets) but a new rural standard is being created by the City Public Works Department based on the project sections and based on County standards. Trip generation will be a factor for determining qualification.

Exhibit 5.13-6 provides a comparison of the cross sections of City Standards No. 107 and No. 108 to the proposed roadway, specifically along "B" Street in the northern portion of the project site.

The design width of the parkway with the water quality portion varies from 5- to 6 feet. The water quality swales are on the low side of the roadway with sloping to the swale side. This design allows water from the paved area to be directed to and treated in a water quality swale prior to entering the storm drain system.

The design width of the parkway with the private equestrian trail varies from 9- to 11 feet. The internal equestrian trails are private are intended primarily for residents to access their property from the on-site perimeter and regional trails. Fencing is on the roadway side only because a majority of the equestrian trail edge borders a 2:1 up-slope.

The design width of the paved section of the roadway section varies from 28- to 32 feet except for the entrance roadway, which is 40 feet. These dimensions are measured from the flowline of the rolled curb. The 28 feet width allows 7 feet of parking on one side keeping 21 feet clear for emergency vehicular access. The 28-foot width roadway provides a 10-foot travel lane on one side and an 11-foot travel lane on the opposite side. The 32-foot width roadway allows 8 feet of parking on one side and provides two 12-foot travel lanes. These paving widths are intended to keep the rural feel of the development and can handle the anticipated traffic loads of about 500-ADT for the 39 unit project.

The internal project trails, which are part of the private roadways system, will be owned and maintained by the Ridgeline HOA and are intended primarily for use by residents to access their personal property. The use of the approximate 0.7 miles of private, internal trails would ultimately be decided by the owner of the trails. Although not primarily intended for public use, public use of these trails would occur from non-residents who may visit residents, users who may wish to explore the property, etc. These trails provide turnouts in excess of the number required by the City's Master Plan of Trails thereby ensuring safety. The fencing would be placed on private property within a 2-foot easement thereby allowing an 8-foot tread width.

Based on these design criteria the proposed internal circulation system, including the deviation from City standards, would not result in a hazard due to the design features of the internal circulation system. Impacts would be less than significant anticipated to occur and no mitigation measures would be required.

Bicycle, Equestrian, and Pedestrian Movements

The Traffic Impact Study prepared for the Ridgeline project evaluated potential conflicts with project traffic interacting with bicycle, equestrian, and pedestrian movements. Following are discussions of each. **Error! Reference source not found.** identifies bicycle, equestrian, and pedestrian movements in relation to the study area intersections.

Bicycle

The proposed project would incrementally increase the demand for bikeways in the vicinity of the site. Data collection on bicyclist movements were taken at the study area intersections to determine potential impacts that proposed project bicycle traffic would have on bicycle activity.

Bicycle lanes, subject to varying standards, are provided along Santiago Canyon Road and Orange Park Boulevard. South Meads Avenue does not provide bicycle lanes. The results of the counts indicated that the network does not have heavy bicyclist activity. The proposed project is not expected to produce a significant amount of bicycle movements since it is a small residential development with an emphasis on equestrian activity.

Therefore, the development of the proposed project would not result in an impact as a result of conflicts with bicycle movements in the vicinity of the proposed project site.

Equestrian

The proposed project would generate equestrian users that would access the on-site recreational trails and potentially access off-site trails. Off-site equestrian users may choose to access the proposed on-site trails and Ride-In Only Arena. These activities could result in vehicular and equestrian conflicts.

Equestrian movements at the study area intersections were observed during the morning and evening peak periods on August 22, 2007, and documented in the Traffic Impact Study prepared for the proposed project. The purpose of observing equestrian movements was to document existing conditions in the vicinity of the project site. The Traffic Impact Study identified 13 equestrian movements during the AM and PM peak-hour periods.

Equestrian movements in the area generally occur along Santiago Canyon Road and North and South Meads Avenue, where equestrian trails are provided. At the proposed project entrance that is in virtually the same location as the existing entrance, four equestrian users were observed using the equestrian trail on South Meads Avenue across from the proposed project entrance during the morning peak hours, and two users were observed during the evening peak hours; however, these users did not represent any crossing movements. Proposed project traffic destined for the south would interact with these equestrians, if they were to cross to the east side of South Meads Avenue at the existing equestrian crossing to the south of the proposed project entrance.

No equestrian crossings were observed at the intersection of Santiago Canyon Road and North Meads Avenue in the morning peak hour, and 10 were observed in the evening peak period. These equestrian crossing took place on the east leg of the intersection (five movements) and south leg of the intersection (five movements) where crosswalks and equestrian pushbuttons are provided. One equestrian crossing was observed in the morning peak period at the intersection of Santiago Canyon Road and Orange Park Boulevard and no crossing were observed in the evening peak period. No equestrian crossings were observed at the intersection of South Meads Avenue and Orange Park Boulevard during the morning peak hour and two crossings were observed during the evening peak hour.

According to a July 2009 estimate of equestrian user generation on the project site by Alice Sorenson, past president of the Equestrian Coalition of Orange County, approximately 293 equestrian rides per week, or approximately 42 rides per day, would result from project implementation. This is based on 2.5 animal units per residence and approximately 3 rides per week by each residence. All of the residential lots would be allowed to have equestrian animals, not only the ones with private equestrian stables. Approximately 75 percent of these rides would occur on the weekend representing an estimate of 11 rides during the week or 2 rides per day. This represents a high estimate and actual ridership may be lower.

The recently prepared "Equestrian Stables Location Feasibility Study, Phase I, Use and Trends Report" prepared for Santa Clara County Parks and Recreation Department and used by Alice Sorenson in her analysis, identified that 75 percent of rides occur during the hours of 9AM and 5 PM, with the other 25 percent occurring before and after these hours. Based on this and applying the same ratio to the number of equestrian rides that would be generated by the Ridgeline project during weekdays is , of the estimated 2 rides per day, a small percentage would occur during the AM and PM peak vehicular periods. The Traffic Impact Study identified the AM peak period from 7:00 to 9:00 AM and the PM period from 4:00 to 6:00 PM

Adding the 13 equestrian movements observed and documented in the Traffic Impact Analysis and assuming this same number would access the project site to the 2 equestrian movements estimated to occur from the Ridgeline project would result in 15 peak hour movements per day. Evenly allocated, there would be approximately 8 AM peak hour movements and 8 PM peak hour movements per day. Based on the foregoing, a maximum of 8 equestrian crossings on Meads Avenue could occur during each peak hour period.

The introduction of equestrian animals and therefore ridership on the project would not introduce a new type of recreational use to the OPA area. The OPA community is dedicated to the equestrian lifestyle and therefore familiar with equestrian users. The estimated number of equestrian crossings on Meads Avenue does not represent a significant safety impact and less than significant impacts would result from implementation of the proposed project. The inclusion of PDF-TRA-1 would ensure the less than significant impact.

Pedestrian

The proposed project would potentially result in hazards due to the design of the pedestrian access points to the proposed project site. Pedestrian activity was observed at each of the study intersections during the morning and evening peak periods on August 22, 2007, to determine potential impacts that proposed project pedestrian traffic increase would have on pedestrian activity.

Potential conflicts between proposed project traffic and pedestrian movements are expected to be minimal. The proposed project would generate 27 new vehicle trips at the proposed project entrance in the morning peak hour and 14 fewer trips in the evening peak hour. Count results at the proposed project entrance showed four pedestrian movements in the morning hours against the 27 new proposed trips, and two pedestrian movements in the evening hours, when the proposed project would be projected to generate fewer trips than the existing on-site uses.

The intersections of Santiago Canyon Road at North Meads Avenue and Santiago Canyon Road at Orange Park Boulevard are signalized intersections that provide pedestrian push buttons and crosswalks for crossing maneuvers. Santiago Canyon Road at Orange Park Boulevard results showed four pedestrian movements that would conflict with 13 new proposed project cars in the morning peak hour, and six pedestrian movements in the evening hours, when the proposed project would generate fewer cars than the existing on-site commercial recreational uses. Santiago Canyon Road at North Meads Avenue results showed six pedestrian movements against 19 new proposed project cars in the morning peak hour, and seven in the evening peak hour.

Orange Park Boulevard at South Meads Avenue is a four way stop-controlled intersection with no crosswalks. Count results for this intersection showed four pedestrian movements against 12 new proposed project cars in the morning peak hour, and four in the evening peak hour.

The pedestrian access network would not be impacted by the proposed project. The results of the counts indicated that the network does not have heavy pedestrian movements. The proposed project would produce a minimal amount of pedestrian activity since it is a small residential development with an emphasis on equestrian activity. The pedestrian activity would be related to walking to a neighbor's house, exercise (i.e., running or jogging), or similar activities.

Implementation of the Ridgeline project would not result in significant impacts to bicycle, equestrian, or pedestrian movements as a result of the project traffic.

Parking Capacity

**Impact 5.13-6 The project has the potential to result in inadequate parking capacity.
[CEQA Transportation and Traffic Threshold 15(f)]**

The proposed project would provide parking spaces for the residential uses consistent with the required parking ratio of the City. The majority of off-street parking would occur on individual lots. The Ride-In Only Arena does not include or require vehicular parking. Should someone choose to

drive a vehicle to meet someone at the Ride-In Only Arena they would be able to temporarily park their car along the roadway. Therefore, less than significant impacts would result related to inadequate parking from project implementation.

5.13.6 - Mitigation Measures

Traffic Increase

No mitigation measures are required.

Hazards

No mitigation measures are required.

Parking Capacity

No mitigation measures are required.

5.13.7 - Project Design Features

PDF-TRA-1 The proposed project includes a trail crossing across Meads Avenue that would consist of, at a minimum, a painted crossing and signage for vehicular traffic indicating a trail crossing.

5.13.8 - Level of Significance After Mitigation

Traffic Increase

Impacts were determined to be less than significant and do not require mitigation.

Hazards

Impacts were determined to be less than significant and do not require mitigation.

Parking Capacity

Impacts were determined to be less than significant and do not require mitigation.

