

# Executive Summary



## ES EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### ES.1 PROJECT LOCATION

The City of Encinitas (City) and Sphere of Influence are composed of approximately 13,328 acres of land in the County of San Diego, roughly 20 miles north of downtown San Diego and 95 miles south of Los Angeles. The jurisdictions that surround the City include: on its north side, the City of Carlsbad; on its south side, the City of Solana Beach; and on the east side, the unincorporated area of Rancho Santa Fe. On the City's west side lies the Pacific Ocean. The Project area is within the Coastal Zone and encompasses five communities—Leucadia, New Encinitas, Olivenhain, Old Encinitas, and Cardiff. This Environmental Assessment (EA) considers 17 candidate sites for rezoning within the City's boundaries. The 17 candidate sites are comprised of 36 parcels and total approximately 111 gross acres.

### ES.2 PROJECT SUMMARY

#### GENERAL PLAN HOUSING ELEMENT

As required by State housing law, the City of Encinitas Draft 2013-2021 Housing Element Update (HEU or Project) is proposed to make adequate provision for the existing and projected housing needs of all economic segments of the Encinitas community. To ensure consistency with current State housing law, the Project updates the existing Encinitas Housing Element and includes revised goals and policies, and new, modified, and continuing implementation programs. The HEU also integrates/updates supporting socioeconomic, demographic, and household data.

The Project proposes General Plan, Zoning Code, and Specific Plan Amendments to as many as 17 low- and very-low income candidate sites (as many as 36 parcels). The proposed General Plan, Zoning Code, and Specific Plan Amendments are specifically intended to accommodate the City's remaining RHNA allocation of 1,511 DU. The candidate sites' maximum realistic yield (MRY), based on the proposed amendments permitted a maximum density of 30 dwelling units (DU) per net acre, would be 2,494 DU.<sup>1</sup> As compared to the adopted zoning MRY,<sup>2</sup> the Project's MRY could result in a net increase of as many as 2,312 DU. The Project also proposes various conforming amendments to the Encinitas General Plan (EGP), Encinitas Municipal Code (EMC) Title 30, *Zoning Code*, Local Coastal Plan, Specific Plans (North 101 Specific Plan and Encinitas Ranch Specific Plan), and ancillary amendments to other planning documents, as necessary for clarification and consistency purposes. Appendix B, *Candidate Sites Table*, describes the 17 candidate sites that comprise the "proposed Project" reviewed in this EA, and presents the proposed General Plan land use designations and zoning for each. Section 3.5, *Project Characteristics*, discusses the proposed Project components in detail.

<sup>1</sup> The MRY is based on "candidate" sites and estimated solely for environmental analysis purposes. Additionally, due to differing sets of governing regulations, these yields are greater than the yields that the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) will credit the City in providing an adequate sites inventory.

<sup>2</sup> The candidate sites' existing land use designations and zoning are detailed in Appendix B, *Candidate Sites Table*.

## HOUSING IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

Housing Element objectives and policies are implemented through various actions (tools) included in the Housing Implementation Plan and specifically intended to encourage housing/neighborhood maintenance, improvement, development, and conservation. The Housing Implementation Plan describes the housing programs from which the quantified objectives are derived, and which are intended to accommodate the City's remaining RHNA allocation. The Housing Implementation Plan specifies the following key actions, among others:

- **PROGRAM 1: ADEQUATE SITES:**
  - *Program 1A: Accommodate the City's Regional Housing Needs Assessment Allocation*
  - *Program 1B: Adopt Amendments to the Zoning Code to Accommodate Lower Income Housing*
  - *Program 1C: Promote the development of accessory housing units*
  - *Program 1D: Ensure that adequate sites remain available throughout the planning period*
  - *Program 1E: Energy conservation and energy efficiency opportunities*
- **PROGRAM 2: AFFORDABLE HOUSING**
  - *Program 2A: Continue and improve inclusionary housing policies*
  - *Program 2B: Facilitate affordable housing for all income levels*
  - *Program 2C: Utilize Section 8 housing choice vouchers*
  - *Program 2D: Ensure that the density bonus ordinance continues to be consistent with State law*
  - *Program 2E: Accommodate specialized housing types*
  - *Program 2F: Continue programs to reduce homelessness*
- **PROGRAM 3: MITIGATION OF CONSTRAINTS**
  - *Program 3A: Establish parking standards appropriate for different kinds of housing*
  - *Program 3B: Modify regulations that constrain the development of housing*
  - *Program 3C: Right to Vote Amendment*
  - *Program 3D: Rescind Obsolete Growth Management Policies and Programs*
  - *Program 3E: Improve the efficiency of the development review process for housing projects*
  - *Program 3F: Review nongovernmental constraints impeding development of approved housing projects*
  - *Program 3G: Seek to create community support for housing at a variety of income levels*
- **PROGRAM 4: CONSERVATION OF EXISTING HOUSING STOCK**
  - *Program 4A: Pursue opportunities to create safe and healthy housing*
  - *Program 4B: Assist in rehabilitating housing*
- **PROGRAM 5: EQUAL HOUSING OPPORTUNITIES**
  - *Program 5A: Reasonably accommodate housing for the disabled*
  - *Program 5B: Promote fair housing*
- **PROGRAM 6: AT RISK HOUSING**
  - *Program 6A: Monitor publicly assisted housing projects*
  - *Program 6B: Explore providing credit under the inclusionary ordinance for preservation of at-risk housing*

## ES.3 PROJECT OBJECTIVES

In substantial conformance with State CEQA Guidelines § 15124, the following primary objectives support the Project's purpose, assist the Lead Agency in developing a reasonable range of alternatives to be evaluated in this EA, and ultimately aid the decision-makers in preparing findings and overriding considerations, if necessary. The Project's purpose is to address the City's housing needs and objectives and meet State law requirements. The Project objectives are to:

1. **Housing Choice.** Accommodate a variety of housing types to meet the needs of all Encinitas residents, creating opportunities for attainably-priced housing for all income groups.
2. **Adequate Supply.** Provide adequate sites with corresponding density to meet the City's RHNA allocation, inclusive of prior planning cycle carryover housing units. Include a buffer sufficient to accommodate the RHNA during the entire planning period given the requirements of the "no net loss" statute.
3. **Effective Implementation.** Adopt State-mandated and locally desired programs to implement the City's Housing Element.
4. **Maintain Community Character.** Integrate future development using a blend of two- and three-story buildings or building elements into the City's community character through project design.
5. **Distribute Multi-Family Housing.** Distribute attached and multi-family housing to the City's five communities.

## ES.4 ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES/MITIGATION SUMMARY

Table ES-1, *Environmental Issues/Mitigation Summary*, which is provided at the end of this Section, summarizes the Project's impacts, mitigation measures, and unavoidable significant impacts identified and analyzed in Section 4.0, *Environmental Analysis*. The mitigation measures identified in the 2016 PEIR are also included, with the additions/changes necessary for the revised Project indicated by "~~deleted text~~" / "underlined text." Refer to the appropriate EA section for detailed information.

## ES.5 SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS

Compliance with the established regulatory framework and recommended mitigation measures outlined in Table ES-1 would avoid/reduce many significant effects to a less than significant level. However, despite implementation of feasible mitigation, the Project could nonetheless result in effects which cannot be fully mitigated. This EA identified the significant environmental effects summarized below, which cannot be avoided if the proposed Project is implemented; see State CEQA Guidelines § 15126(b). Various benefits would accrue from Project implementation, which would be weighed against the Project's potential adverse effects, in deciding whether to approve the Project. These potential benefits will be set forth in a "Statement of Overriding Considerations," which CEQA requires prior to approving a project with significant unavoidable impacts; see State CEQA Guidelines § 15093.

### AESTHETICS

- Despite compliance with the established regulatory framework, future development on Candidate Sites #3 and #10 would be dissimilar to the existing neighborhoods and could negatively impact the neighborhoods' characters. Therefore, future development of Candidate Sites #3 and #10 would result in significant unavoidable impacts concerning visual character.

## AIR QUALITY

Despite compliance with the established regulatory framework and recommended mitigation measures, the Project would result in significant unavoidable air quality impacts concerning the following:

- Regional Air Quality Strategy Consistency: The candidate sites' combined emissions (Project buildout) would exceed the SDAPCD significance thresholds for criteria pollutants at the plan level. Exceeding these thresholds at the plan level has the potential to hinder the region's compliance with each RAQS.
- Criteria Pollutants:
  - Short-Term Construction Emissions: Neither the degree of concurrent construction nor project-specific details are known, and it cannot be determined with certainty that construction emissions would be reduced to below regulatory thresholds. Therefore, the Project would result in a significant unavoidable impact concerning construction emissions at the plan level. Following compliance with the established regulatory framework and recommended mitigation measures, impacts at the Project level would be less than significant.
  - Long-Term Operational Emissions: All future development projects would operate concurrently at buildout, and buildout operational emissions would exceed significance thresholds for all criteria pollutants. Therefore, at the plan level the Project would result in a significant unavoidable impact. Following compliance with the established regulatory framework, impacts at the Project level would be less than significant.

## CULTURAL

Despite compliance with EGP Policies 7.1 and 7.2, EMC §30.34.050, and Mitigation Measure CUL-2, the Project would have potential to result in significant and unavoidable impacts concerning the alteration/destruction of an archaeological/prehistoric structure, object, or site, and adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource.

## GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Despite compliance with the established regulatory framework and recommended mitigation measures, Project implementation would result in significant and unavoidable impacts concerning the following:

- Greenhouse Gas Emissions: The total greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from Candidate Site #9 (largest site) long-term operations would be approximately 3,333.20 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e/yr, which would exceed the City's 900 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e/yr interim screening threshold for individual projects. Since several other candidate sites would involve similar MRY, their operational emissions would similarly exceed significance thresholds.
- Compliance with the City's CAP: Although the Project would not directly conflict with the policies and reduction measures within the City's CAP, the potential exceedance of the City's interim screening threshold would potentially conflict with the City's ability to achieve the CAP's GHG emissions reduction targets. Impacts would be significant and unavoidable despite the implementation of Mitigation Measures GHG-1 and GHG-2 at the plan level.
- Cumulative GHG Emissions: Because GHG emissions are global in nature, the Project's potential exceedance of the City's interim GHG screening threshold would also result in a cumulative impact despite compliance with the established regulatory framework and recommended mitigation measures.

## LAND USE AND PLANNING

Despite compliance with the established regulatory framework, future development on Candidate Sites #3 and #10 would be dissimilar to the existing neighborhoods and could negatively impact the neighborhoods' very low-density characters. Therefore, consistent with the significance criteria set forth in the 2016 PEIR, future development of Candidate Sites #3 and #10 would result in significant unavoidable neighborhood compatibility impacts from the Project's effects on visual character. Future development of Candidate Site #9 would result in a significant unavoidable impact to agricultural resources.

## TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC

Despite compliance with the established regulatory framework and recommended mitigation measures, the Project would result in significant unavoidable transportation and traffic impacts concerning the following facilities:

### Roadway Segments

- La Costa Avenue: North Coast Highway 101 to Vulcan Avenue – LOS F
- La Costa Avenue: Vulcan Avenue to Sheridan Road – LOS F
- Encinitas Boulevard: I-5 SB Ramps to I-5 NB Ramps – LOS F
- Encinitas Boulevard: I-5 NB Ramps to Saxony Road – LOS F
- Encinitas Boulevard: Quail Gardens Drive to Delphinium Street – LOS F
- Encinitas Boulevard: Delphinium Street to Balour Drive – LOS F
- Encinitas Boulevard: Balour Drive to Via Cantabria – LOS F
- Santa Fe Drive: Nardo Road to Windsor Road/Bonita Drive – LOS E
- Santa Fe Drive: Windsor Road/Bonita Drive to Balour Drive – LOS E
- Santa Fe Drive: Balour Drive to Lake Drive – LOS E
- Santa Fe Drive: Lake Drive to Crest Drive – LOS E
- Santa Fe Drive: Crest Drive to El Camino Real – LOS E
- South Rancho Santa Fe Road: City of Encinitas Limits to El Mirlo – LOS F

### Intersections

- # 6 – Vulcan Avenue at La Costa Avenue – AM: LOS E, PM: LOS E
- # 17 – Saxony Road at Leucadia Boulevard – AM: LOS E, PM: LOS E
- # 45 – Balour Drive at Santa Fe Drive – AM: LOS F, PM: LOS F

### Ramp Intersections

- I-5 Northbound Ramps/Leucadia Boulevard – over capacity during the PM peak hour
- I-5 Southbound Ramps/Encinitas Boulevard – over capacity during the AM and PM peak hours

### Ramp Meters

- I-5 Northbound on-ramp at Encinitas Boulevard – 20 minutes during PM peak hour
- I-5 Southbound on-ramp at Encinitas Boulevard – 17.0 minutes during AM peak hour
- I-5 Southbound on-ramp at Santa Fe Drive – 34.0 minutes during AM peak hour

## ES.6 SUMMARY OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

In substantial conformance with State CEQA Guidelines § 15126.6, this Section is a summary of the alternatives to the Project, which could feasibly attain most of the Project’s basic objectives, while avoiding or substantially lessening its significant effects. The evaluation provided in Chapter 9.0, *Alternatives to the Proposed Project*, considers the comparative merits of each alternative. The analysis also focuses on alternatives capable of avoiding or substantially lessening the Project’s significant environmental effects, even if the alternative would impede, to some degree, the attainment of the proposed Project objectives. The following alternatives are considered in Chapter 9.0:

- “No Project” Alternative
- “Alternative Sites” Alternative

Throughout Chapter 9.0, the alternatives’ impacts are analyzed for each environmental issue area, as examined in Sections 4.1 through 4.14. In this manner, each alternative was compared to the Project on an issue-by-issue basis. *Table 9-7, Comparison of Alternatives*, outlines the alternatives analyzed and provides a summary comparison of each alternative’s impacts in relation to the Project. The following is a summary description of each of the alternatives evaluated in Section 9.0.

### ES.6.1 “No Project/Adopted General Plan” Alternative

According to State CEQA Guidelines § 15126.6(e), the specific alternative of “no project” shall also be evaluated along with its impact. The purpose of describing and analyzing a no project alternative is to allow decision makers to compare the impacts of approving the proposed Project with impacts of not approving the proposed Project. The no project analysis is required to discuss the existing conditions (at the time the Notice of Preparation is published, as well as what would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future, if the Project were not approved, based on current plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services.

The “No Project/Adopted General Plan” Alternative assumes that the Project (HEU) would not be implemented. Under this Alternative, the Project’s proposed General Plan/Zoning Code/Specific Plan Amendments to the 17 candidate sites would not occur. The approximately seven dwelling units (7 DU) and approximately 793,757 square feet (SF) of non-residential land uses located on the candidate sites would not be removed/replaced by future residential development. Overall, the future development accommodated through Project implementation of as many as 2,494 DU, with a resultant population growth of approximately 6,250 persons (see *Table 3-4, Candidate Sites’ Forecast Population*), would not occur.

This Alternative assumes the City’s buildout land use and population growth projections for the City and its sphere of influence (SOI) area consistent with the EGP Land Use Element. The candidate sites’ maximum realistic yield (MRY) based on existing/adopted EGP land use designations for each of the 36 parcels that make up the 17 candidate sites would be 191 DU and approximately 831,016 square feet (SF) of non-residential land uses. With this Alternative, the forecast population growth would be approximately 479 persons. This Alternative would result in 2,303 fewer DU as compared to the proposed Project. When compared to existing on-the-ground (OTG) land uses, this Alternative would result in an additional 184 DU and an additional 37,259 SF of non-residential land uses.

## ES.6.2 “Alternative Candidate Sites” Alternative

The “Alternative Candidate Sites” Alternative’s characteristics are generally, as described for the proposed Project, with certain exceptions described below. This Alternative involves General Plan, Zoning Code, and Specific Plan Amendments to as many as 20 low- and very-low income candidate sites (as many as 46 parcels totaling approximately 107 acres); see Appendix H, “*Alternative Candidate Sites*” *Alternative Table*. Like the Project, this Alternative also proposes various conforming amendments to the EGP, EMC Title 30, *Zoning Code*, Local Coastal Plan, Specific Plans (North 101 Specific Plan, Encinitas Ranch Specific Plan, and Downtown Specific Plan), and ancillary amendments to other planning documents, as necessary for clarification and consistency purposes.

The candidate sites’ MRY, based on the proposed zoning under this Alternative would be 2,201 DU and 697,489 SF of non-residential land uses. With this Alternative, the forecast population growth would be approximately 5,516 persons. Because this Alternative proposes only to add the R-30 Overlay on each candidate site, the existing underlying zoning would remain on all 20 sites. Thus, as compared to the adopted zoning, the non-residential land uses’ MRY under this Alternative would be the same, and the comparative analyses focus on the change in residential uses.

As compared to existing OTG land uses, this Alternative’s MRY could result in a net increase of as many as 2,191 DU and a net decrease of as much as 750,805 SF of non-residential land uses. As compared to the proposed Project’s adopted zoning MRY, this Alternative could result in a net decrease of as many as 293 DU, or approximately 12 percent less than the proposed Project.

As compared to the proposed Project, this Alternative:

- Involves 20 candidate sites (the Project involves 17)
- Involves 46 parcels totaling approximately 107.3 gross acres (the Project involves 36 parcels totaling approximately 111.2 gross acres)
- Excludes two Candidate Sites: #AD06 and #10
- Includes five new Candidate Sites:
  - #AD11 - Manchester Avenue West Sites
  - #AD12 - Rancho Santa Fe East
  - #AD14 - Harrison
  - #AD31 - New Meyer Property (Meyer No & So)
  - #AD32 - New Garden View Court (previously Frog's Gym)
- Candidate Site #3: Proposes: revised gross and net site areas; and RR-3 instead of R-30 Overlay
- Candidate Site #AD09: Proposes: revised net site area; and R-35 Overlay, instead of R-30 Overlay

### “ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR” ALTERNATIVE

According to State CEQA Guidelines § 15126.6(e), “*No Project*” *Alternative*, “if the environmentally superior alternative is the “No Project” alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives.” The “No Project/Adopted General Plan” Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative, because it would avoid many of the proposed Project’s impacts. Therefore, in compliance with CEQA requirements, an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives is identified. The environmentally superior alternative is the “Alternative Candidate Sites” Alternative, given it would achieve the greatest impact reductions in various environmental issue areas. Additionally, the “Alternative Candidate Sites” Alternative would satisfy all Project Objectives.

## **ES.7 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY AND ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED**

The State CEQA Guidelines require a summary that identifies: areas of controversy known to the Lead Agency, including issues raised by agencies and the public (State CEQA Guidelines § 15123(b)(2)); and issues to be resolved, including the choice among alternatives and whether or how to mitigate the significant effects (State CEQA Guidelines § 15123(b)(3)).

Based on the City's review of available information and comments received from the public and public agencies, as well as informational City of Encinitas public meetings regarding Project implementation, the following issues may either be controversial or require resolution:

- Candidate Site Siting
- Overall impacts from development and whether development should be allowed: The environmental impacts resulting from the proposed Project are evaluated in Sections 4.1 through 4.14.
- Impacts to existing schools: Evaluated in Section 4.12, *Public Services and Recreation*.
- Proposed candidate sites which would permit owner-occupied and rental multi-family residential "by right" uses pursuant to GOV § 65583.2(h) (e.g., without a Conditional Use Permit, Planned Unit Development permit, or other discretionary action): The environmental impacts resulting from potential "by right" uses are evaluated in Sections 4.1 through 4.14.

These issues have been considered in this EA, where applicable.

TABLE ES-1: ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES / MITIGATION SUMMARY			
SECTION - ISSUE	IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
<b>AESTHETICS</b>			
4.1.4 – Issue 1	<b>Plan Consistency:</b> <i>Would the Project conflict with any City policy or regulation relative to the protection of visual resources (i.e., General Plan/LCP policies, Hillside/Inland Bluff Overlay Zone, Scenic Visual Corridor Overlay Zone/ Design Review Guidelines) thereby resulting in a negative aesthetic/visual impact?</i>	None	Less Than Significant Impact
4.1.4 - Issues 2 & 3	<b>Public Views:</b> <i>Would the Project result in development that:</i> <i>a. Is incompatible in shape, form, or intensity, such that public views from designated open space areas, view corridors or scenic highways, or to any significant visual landmarks or scenic vistas would be substantially blocked?</i> <i>b. Is in a highly visible area (e.g., on a canyon edge, hilltop or adjacent to an interstate highway) and would strongly contrast with the surrounding development or natural topography through excessive height, bulk, signage, or architectural projections?</i>	None	Less Than Significant Impact
4.1.4 - Issue 4	<b>Community Character:</b> <i>Would the project introduce features which would conflict with important visual elements or the quality of the community/neighborhood (such as theme, style, setbacks, density, size, massing, coverage, scale, color, architecture, building materials, light/glare, etc.) and would thereby negatively and substantially alter the existing character of neighborhoods?</i>	None	Significant Unavoidable Impact

TABLE ES-1: ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES / MITIGATION SUMMARY			
SECTION - ISSUE	IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
4.1.4 - Issue 5	<b>Scenic Resources:</b> <i>Would the project result in the physical loss, isolation, degradation or destruction of a visual resource or community identification symbol or landmark or other feature that contribute to the valued visual character or image of the neighborhood, community, or localized area (e.g., a stand of mature trees, coastal bluff, native habitat, historic landmark)?</i>	None	Less Than Significant Impact
<b>AIR QUALITY</b>			
4.2.4 - Issue 1	<b>Regional Air Quality Strategy Consistency:</b> <i>Would the Project conflict with the primary goals of the Regional Air Quality Strategy Consistency?</i>	AQ-1: Prior to the next update to the Regional Housing Needs Assessment and within six months within six months of the certification of the final EIR, the City shall provide a revised housing forecast to SANDAG to ensure that any revisions to the population and employment projections used by SDAPCD in updating the RAQS and the SIP will accurately reflect anticipated growth due to the HEU.	Significant Unavoidable Impact
4.2.4 - Issue 2	<b>Criteria Pollutants:</b> <i>Would the Project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable Federal or State ambient air quality standard (including release emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?</i>	AQ-2: <del>For future development of housing sites consistent with the new zone program, wherein the City has determined a potential for ROG emissions impacts could occur, the Planning and Building Department shall require that the construction contractor be limited to the use of architectural coating (paint and primer) products that have a low to no-VOC rating. <u>Construction Emissions. Prior to demolition, grading, or building permit approval, and in accordance with SDAPCD’s promulgated methodology protocols, an Air Quality Assessment for Construction-Related Emissions shall be prepared for projects that would exceed the following SDAPCD significance thresholds for construction-related emissions (or those in place at the time of the development application). Future development shall mitigate</u></del>	Significant Unavoidable Impact

TABLE ES-1: ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES / MITIGATION SUMMARY			
SECTION - ISSUE	IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
		<u>construction emissions to below SDAPCD’s thresholds of significance.</u>	
4.2.4 - Issue 3	<b>Sensitive Receptors:</b> <i>Would the Project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</i>	<p>AQ-3: <u>Diesel Particulate Matter.</u> In order to reduce impacts associated with exposure to diesel particulate matter, the following mitigation is recommended.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Future development under the new zone program shall be designed to minimize exposure to roadway-related pollutants and exposure shall be mitigated to the maximum extent feasible. Design features may include but are not be limited to: maximizing the distance between the roadway and sensitive receptors; locating air intake at the non-roadway facing sides of buildings, and ensuring that windows nearest to the roadway do not open. The orientation and placement of outdoor facilities designed for moderate physical activity shall be placed as far from the emission source as possible. Mitigation may also include installing mechanical ventilation systems with fresh air filtration and constructing a physical barrier between the roadway source and receptors of pollutants (e.g., sound wall or vegetative planting).</li> <li>• New parks with athletic fields, courts, and other outdoor facilities designed for moderate to vigorous activity under the new zone program should be sited at least 500 feet from the freeway. Exceptions to this recommended practice should be made only upon a written finding from a decision-making body that the benefits of such development outweigh the public health risks or that a site-specific analysis demonstrates a less than significant risk.</li> </ul>	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated

TABLE ES-1: ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES / MITIGATION SUMMARY			
SECTION - ISSUE	IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ventilation Systems: Ventilation systems that are rated at Minimum Efficiency Reporting Value of “MERV13” or better for enhanced particulate removal efficiency shall be provided on all residential units within the new zone, located within 500 feet of I-5.</li> <li>• City staff shall ensure that the aforementioned requirements are included on plans associated with any permit for future development consistent with the new zone program and submitted for approval. The City shall verify compliance on-site prior to occupancy clearance. Staff shall also review the future Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions for inclusion of guidelines pertaining to the proper maintenance/ replacement of filters.</li> </ul>	
<b>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b>			
4.3.4 - Issue 1	<b>Sensitive Species:</b> <i>Would the Project have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by CDFW or USFWS?</i>	<p>BIO-1: Applications for future development of housing sites consistent with the new zone program, wherein the City has determined a potential for <u>significant</u> impacts to sensitive biological resources, shall be required to comply with the following mitigation framework:</p> <p>a) A site-specific general biological resources survey shall be conducted to identify the presence of any sensitive biological resources, including any sensitive plant or wildlife species. A biological resources report shall be submitted to the City to document the results of the biological resources survey. The report shall include (1) the methods used to determine the presence of sensitive biological resources; (2) vegetation mapping of all vegetation communities and/or land cover types; (3) the locations of any sensitive plant or wildlife species; (4) an evaluation of the potential for</p>	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated

TABLE ES-1: ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES / MITIGATION SUMMARY			
SECTION - ISSUE	IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
		<p>occurrence of any listed, rare, and narrow endemic species; and (5) an evaluation of the significance of any potential direct or indirect impacts from the proposed project. If potentially significant impacts to sensitive biological resources are identified, future project-level grading and site plans shall incorporate project design features to minimize direct impacts on sensitive biological resources to the extent feasible, and the report shall also recommend appropriate mitigation to reduce the impacts to below a level of significance.</p> <p>b) If suitable habitat for sensitive species is identified within the housing site based on the general biological survey, then focused presence/absence surveys shall be conducted in accordance with applicable resource agency survey protocols.</p> <p>BIO-2: Prior to issuance of a permit for grading or vegetation removal, future development of housing sites consistent with the new zone program, wherein the City has determined <del>to</del> the potential for <u>significant</u> impacts to least Bell’s vireo, shall require USFWS protocol surveys for least Bell’s vireo should project construction occur within 300 feet of riparian habitat during the breeding season (April 10 to July 31). If least Bell’s vireo is identified during the protocol surveys, then noise attenuation measures shall be required to ensure that noise levels from construction do not exceed a 60 A-weighted decibels [dB(A)] hourly average per hour at the edge of the riparian habitat or to the ambient noise level if it exceeds 60 dB(A) prior to construction. Construction noise monitoring shall be required to verify that noise levels at the edge of occupied habitat are maintained below 60 dB(A) hourly</p>	

TABLE ES-1: ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES / MITIGATION SUMMARY			
SECTION - ISSUE	IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
		<p>average unless an analysis completed by a qualified acoustician shows that noise generated by construction activities would not exceed 60 dB(A) hourly average at the edge of occupied habitat.</p> <p>BIO-3: Prior to issuance of a permit for grading or vegetation removal, future development of housing sites consistent with the new zone program, wherein the City has determined the presence of mature trees and/or native vegetation suitable for nesting birds in the future, shall require a preconstruction survey to determine the presence of active bird nests if vegetation clearing is proposed during the typical bird breeding season (January 15– September 15). The nesting bird survey shall be performed by a qualified biologist within one week prior to the start of vegetation clearing or construction activities. No direct impacts shall occur to any nesting birds or their eggs, chicks, or nests. If an active nest is located, nest avoidance measures would be required in accordance with the MBTA and CDFW code.</p>	
4.3.4 - Issue 2	<p><b>Sensitive Vegetation Communities:</b> <i>Would the Project have a substantial adverse effect on any sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by CDFW or USFWS?</i></p>	<p>BIO-4: Prior to issuance of a permit for grading or vegetation removal, future development of housing sites consistent with the new zone program <u>which</u> resulting in <u>significant</u> impacts to sensitive vegetation communities, shall implement avoidance and minimization measures and provide suitable mitigation in accordance with the MHCP.</p> <p>Future project-level grading and site plans shall incorporate project design features to minimize <del>direct</del> <u>significant</u> impacts on sensitive vegetation communities including but not limited to riparian habitats, wetlands, non-native grassland, and coastal sage scrub. Mitigation</p>	<p>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</p>

TABLE ES-1: ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES / MITIGATION SUMMARY			
SECTION - ISSUE	IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
		for <u>significant</u> impacts to sensitive upland habitats shall occur in accordance with the mitigation ratios identified in Tables 4-6 and 4-7 of the MHCP. Mitigation for <u>significant</u> impacts to sensitive vegetation communities shall be implemented at the time future development projects are proposed.	
4.3.4 - Issue 3	<b>Wetlands:</b> <i>Would the Project have a substantial adverse effect on wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?</i>	<p>BIO-5: Prior to issuance of a permit for grading or vegetation removal, future development of housing sites consistent with the <u>HEU</u> new zone program, wherein the City has determined the potential for impacts to sensitive biological resources, shall be required to prepare a site-specific biological resources survey. Should any potential jurisdictional waters be identified on-site during the general biological resources survey, then a jurisdictional wetlands delineation of the housing site shall be conducted following the methods outlined in the USACE’s 1987 <i>Wetlands Delineation Manual</i> and the <i>Regional Supplement to the Corps of Engineers Delineation Manual for the Arid West Region</i>. The limits of any riparian habitats on-site under the sole jurisdiction of CDFW shall also be delineated, as well as any special aquatic sites (excluding vernal pools) that may not meet Federal jurisdictional criteria but are regulated by CCC and the RWQCB.</p> <p>Avoidance measures based on project-level grading and site plans shall be incorporated into the project design to minimize direct impacts to jurisdictional waters consistent with Federal, State, and City guidelines. Unavoidable impacts to wetlands shall be minimized to the maximum extent practicable and would be subject to alternatives and mitigation analyses consistent with U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 404(b)(1) findings and procedures under the USACE’s permit process.</p>	

TABLE ES-1: ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES / MITIGATION SUMMARY			
SECTION - ISSUE	IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
		<p>Unavoidable impacts would require the in-kind creation of new wetland of the same type lost, at a ratio determined by the applicable regulatory agencies that would prevent any net loss of wetland functions and values. Wetland creation on-site or within the same wetland system shall be given preference over replacement off-site or within a different system. The City shall also control use and development in surrounding areas of influence to wetlands with the application of buffer zones. At a minimum, 100-foot-wide buffers shall be provided upland of tidal wetlands <del>with the exception of</del> <u>except for non-tidal riparian vegetation</u> areas which will require 50-foot-wide buffers, unless the applicant demonstrates that a buffer of lesser width would protect the resources of the wetland based on site-specific information. Use and development within buffer areas shall be limited to minor passive recreational uses with fencing, delitation or erosion control facilities, or other improvements deemed necessary to protect the habitat, to be <del>located</del> in the upper (upland) half of the buffer when feasible. All wetlands and buffers shall be permanently conserved or protected through the application of an open space easement or other suitable device.</p> <p>All new development adjacent to wetlands and waters shall be required to adhere to measures outlined in the City’s Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance to avoid degradation of lagoons, other wetland habitats, and upland habitats from erosion and sedimentation. These measures include restrictions on the timing and amount of grading and vegetation removal. For example, grading or vegetation removal shall be prohibited during the rainy season (October 1 through April 15) without an approved erosion control plan and program in place. In addition, all necessary erosion control devices must be in</p>	

TABLE ES-1: ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES / MITIGATION SUMMARY			
SECTION - ISSUE	IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
		place, and appropriate monitoring and maintenance must be implemented during the grading period.	
4.3.4 - Issue 4	<b>Wildlife Corridors:</b> <i>Would the Project interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?</i>	None	Less than Significant Impact
4.3.4 - Issue 5	<b>Habitat Conservation Planning:</b> <i>Would the Project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP), NCCP, or other approved local, regional, or State HCP?</i>	None	Less than Significant Impact
4.3.4 - Issue 6	<b>Policies and Ordinances Protecting Biological Resources:</b> <i>Would the Project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</i>	None	Less than Significant Impact
<b>CULTURAL RESOURCES</b>			
4.4.4 - Issue 1	<b>Historical Resources:</b> <i>Would the Project result in the alteration, including the adverse physical or aesthetic effects, and/or the destruction of a prehistoric or historic structure, object or site?</i>	<p>CUL-1: Applications for future development of housing sites consistent with the new zone program, wherein the City has determined a potential for impacts to historical resources, shall be required to comply with the following mitigation framework:</p> <p>a) Prior to the issuance of any permit for a future development project, the age and original structural integrity and context of any buildings/structures occurring on the housing sites shall be verified. The project applicant shall submit in conjunction with the development permit application, verification of the age and original structural integrity of all on-site structures.</p>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated



TABLE ES-1: ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES / MITIGATION SUMMARY			
SECTION - ISSUE	IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
		<p>b) For any building/structures in excess of 50 years of age having its original structural integrity intact, a qualified professional historian shall determine whether the affected building/structure is historically significant. The evaluation of historic architectural resources shall be based on criteria such as age, location, context, association with an important person or event, uniqueness, or structural integrity, as indicated in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5. A historical resource report shall be submitted by the project applicant to the City and shall include the methods used to determine the presence or absence of historical resources, identify potential impacts from the proposed project, and evaluate the significance of any historical resources identified.</p>	
4.4.4 - Issue 2	<p><b>Archaeological Resources:</b> <i>Would the Project result in the alteration, including the adverse physical or aesthetic effects, and/or the destruction of a prehistoric or historic structure, object or site?</i></p> <p><i>Would the Project result in any impact to existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area?</i></p>	<p>CUL-2: Applications for future development of housing sites consistent with the new zone program, wherein the City has determined a potential for impacts to <del>historical</del> <u>archaeological and tribal cultural</u> resources, shall be required to comply with the following mitigation framework:</p> <p>Prior to the issuance of any permit for future development consistent with the new zone program located on a previously undisturbed housing site, an archaeological survey shall be conducted by a qualified archaeologist to evaluate the presence of archaeological <u>and tribal cultural</u> resources and the need for project impact mitigation by preservation, relocation, or other methods. <u>An archaeological resource report shall be submitted by the project applicant to the City and shall include the methods used to determine the presence or</u></p>	Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE ES-1: ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES / MITIGATION SUMMARY			
SECTION - ISSUE	IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
		<p><u>absence of archaeological/tribal cultural resources, identify potential impacts from the proposed project, and evaluate the significance of any archaeological/tribal cultural resources identified. If potentially significant impacts to an identified archaeological/tribal cultural resources are identified, the report shall also recommend appropriate mitigation to reduce the impacts to below a level of significance. The archaeological survey should include a records search at the South Coastal Information Center branch of the California Historical Research Information System, to determine if previously recorded prehistoric or historic archaeological resources exist on the housing site. In addition, the Native American Heritage Commission should be contacted to perform a Sacred Lands File Search. An archaeological resource report detailing the results of the record search, Sacred Lands Search, and the field survey of the housing site shall be submitted by the project applicant to the City. The report shall include the methods used to determine the presence or absence of archaeological resources, identify potential impacts from the proposed project, and evaluate the significance of any archaeological resources identified. If potentially significant impacts to an identified archaeological resource are identified, the report shall also recommend appropriate mitigation to reduce the impacts to below a level of significance. All information regarding site locations, Native American human remains, and associated funerary objects should be in a separate confidential addendum and not be made available for public disclosure. Reports shall be submitted to the South Coastal Information Center upon finalization.</u></p>	

TABLE ES-1: ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES / MITIGATION SUMMARY			
SECTION - ISSUE	IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
4.4.4 - Issue 3	<b>Paleontological Resources:</b> <i>Allow development to occur that could significantly impact a unique paleontological resource or a geologic formation possessing a moderate to high fossil bearing potential?</i>	<p>CUL-3: Applications for future development of housing sites consistent with the new zone program, wherein the City has determined a potential for impacts to paleontological resources, shall be required to comply with the following mitigation framework:</p> <p>A qualified paleontological monitor shall be present during grading on housing sites where development would require the excavation of over 1,000 cubic yards of a geologic formation with high resource potential to contain paleontological resources, excavation depths within the geologic formation of 10 feet or greater, or over 2,000 cubic yards of a geologic formation with moderate resource potential to contain paleontological resources. Geologic formations would be determined by a site-specific geotechnical study. The monitor shall have the authority to stop and/or divert grading, trenching, or excavating if a significant paleontological resource is encountered. An excavation plan shall be implemented to mitigate the discovery. Excavation shall include the salvage of the fossil remains (simple excavation or plaster-jacketing of larger and/or fragile specimens); recording stratigraphic and geologic data; and transport of fossil remains to laboratory for processing and curation.</p>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
4.4.4 - Issue 4	<b>Human Remains:</b> <i>Result in the disturbance of any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</i>	None	Less than Significant Impact
4.4.4 - Issue 5	<b>Tribal Cultural Resources:</b> <i>Would the Project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section</i>	See Mitigation Measure CUL-2 above	Significant and Unavoidable Impact

TABLE ES-1: ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES / MITIGATION SUMMARY			
SECTION - ISSUE	IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
	<p>21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:</p> <p>a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k)?</p> <p>b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe?</p>		
<b>GEOLOGY AND SOILS</b>			
4.5.4 - Issue 1	<p><b>Seismic Hazards:</b> Impacts related to geology and soils would be significant if the Project would expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</p> <p>a. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault (refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42);</p> <p>b. Strong seismic ground shaking;</p> <p>c. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction; or</p>	None	Less than Significant Impact



TABLE ES-1: ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES / MITIGATION SUMMARY			
SECTION - ISSUE	IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
	d. <i>Landslides.</i>		
4.5.4 - Issue 2	<b>Soil Erosion:</b> <i>Impacts related to geology and soils would be significant if the Project would result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.</i>	None	Less than Significant Impact
4.5.4 - Issues 3 & 4	<p><b>Unstable and Expansive Soils:</b> <i>Impacts related to geology and soils would be significant if the Project would:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Be located on a geologic unity or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the Project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse; or</i></li> <li>• <i>Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property.</i></li> </ul>	None	Less than Significant Impact
<b>GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS</b>			
4.6.4 - Issue 1	<b>GHG Emissions:</b> <i>Would the Project generate GHG emissions that may have a significant impact on the environment?</i>	<p><del>GHG-1: Within six months of adopting the HEU, the City shall provide a revised land use plan to SANDAG to ensure that any revisions to the population and employment projections used in updating the SCS will accurately reflect anticipated growth due to the HEU.<sup>3</sup>—Prior to demolition, grading, or building permit approval, and in accordance with City and SDAPCD promulgated methodology protocols, a Greenhouse Gas Emissions Assessment shall be prepared for future developments that would exceed the applicable 900 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e interim screening threshold of significance (or those in place at the time of the development application). Future</del></p>	Significant Unavoidable Impact
4.6.4 - Issue 2	<b>Policies, Plans, and Regulations Intended to Reduce GHG Emissions:</b> <i>Would the Project conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs?</i>		

<sup>3</sup> The City adopted its Climate Action Plan (CAP) in January 2018, thus, has already complied with this measure.



TABLE ES-1: ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES / MITIGATION SUMMARY			
SECTION - ISSUE	IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
		<p><u>development shall mitigate GHG emissions to below this threshold.</u></p> <p>GHG-2: To mitigate citywide GHG impacts at the program-level, the City shall <u>update and adopt a qualified climate action plan</u> the City's Climate Action Plan, as <u>needed</u>, within 20 months after the date the HEU becomes effective. The <u>Climate Action Plan</u> shall contain the following components:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The City's goals for reducing GHG emissions consistent with the statewide reduction goals outlined in Assembly Bill (AB) 32, <u>Senate Bill (SB) 32</u> and expressed in Executive Orders S-03-05, and B-30-15;</li> <li>2. Quantified community and municipal GHG emissions inventories for a baseline year and business as usual emissions <del>through 2050</del> <u>consistent with the California Air Resources Board's 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan</u>;</li> <li>3. Identification of emission reduction required to meet GHG emissions targets consistent with the California Air Resources Board's <u>2017</u> Climate Change Scoping Plan and related statewide policies and regulations; and</li> <li>4. GHG reduction measures consisting of project-level implementation measures as well as citywide policies, standards, and programs. The project-level and citywide measures will be designed to achieve emissions reductions that would <u>collectively</u> meet or exceed the established GHG reduction targets in line with statewide goals expressed in AB 32, <u>SB 32</u> and Executive Order B-30-15.</li> </ol>	

TABLE ES-1: ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES / MITIGATION SUMMARY			
SECTION - ISSUE	IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
		<p>Upon update of the Climate Action Plan, future development shall be reviewed for consistency with the CAP, and projects may utilize the project implementation checklist to ensure compliance with the City's GHG reduction targets.</p> <p>GHG-3: <del>Until the adoption of a qualified climate action plan (or in the event a climate action plan is not adopted), a-</del> All discretionary projects that exceed the CAPCOA 900 MTCO<sub>2</sub>E screening threshold shall prepare a project-specific GHG analysis that identifies an appropriate project-level significance threshold and project-specific mitigation measures. Mitigation measures that may be applied at the future project-level include, but are not limited to those identified in Table A 4.6-10 below <u>Menu of Potential Project-Level GHG Reduction Measures</u>. The project-level analysis shall demonstrate that, with implementation of the <u>applicable</u> mitigation measures identified in Table 4.6 that are applicable to the project, the project will not impede implementation of AB 32 or <u>SB 32 Executive Order B-30-15</u>.</p>	
<b>HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS</b>			
4.7.4 - Issues 1, 2 & 3	<b>Hazardous Materials – Use, Transport, Disposal; Accidental Release; and Emissions near a School:</b> <i>Impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials would be significant if the project would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials; create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment; or emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely</i>	<p>HAZ-1 Future projects <u>on Candidate Sites #5, #6, #8, #9, #11, #12, #AD2, #AD6, #AD7, #AD8, #AD9</u> shall be required to identify potential conditions, which require further regulatory oversight and demonstrate compliance based on the following measures prior to issuance of any permits:</p> <p>A. A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) shall be completed in accordance with the American Society of Testing and Materials (ASTM)</p>	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated

TABLE ES-1: ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES / MITIGATION SUMMARY			
SECTION - ISSUE	IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
	<p><i>hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 0.25-mile of an existing or proposed school.</i></p>	<p>Standards. If hazardous materials are identified requiring remediation, a Phase II ESA and remediation effort shall be conducted in conformance with Federal, State, and local regulations.</p> <p>B. If the Phase II ESA identifies the need for remediation, then the following shall occur prior to the issuance of grading permits:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The applicant shall retain a qualified environmental engineer to develop a soil and/or groundwater management plan to address the notification, monitoring, sampling, testing, handling, storage, and disposal of contaminated media or substances (soil, groundwater). The qualified environmental consultant shall monitor excavations and grading activities in accordance with the plan. The groundwater management and monitoring plans shall be approved by the City prior to development of the site.</li> <li>2. The applicant shall submit documentation showing that contaminated soil and/or groundwater on proposed development parcels have been avoided or remediated to meet cleanup requirements established by appropriate local regulatory agencies (Regional Water Quality Control Board [RWQCB]/DTSC/DEH) based on the future planned land use of the specific area within</li> </ol>	

TABLE ES-1: ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES / MITIGATION SUMMARY			
SECTION - ISSUE	IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
		<p>the boundaries of the site (i.e., commercial, residential), and that the risk to human health of future occupants of these areas therefore has been reduced to below a level of significance.</p> <p>3. The applicant shall obtain written authorization from the appropriate regulatory agency (RWQCB/DTSC/DEH) confirming the completion of remediation. A copy of the authorization shall be submitted to the City to confirm that all appropriate remediation has been completed and that the proposed development parcel has been cleaned up to the satisfaction of the regulatory agency. In the situation where previous contamination has occurred on a site that has a previously closed case or on a site included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, the DEH shall be notified of the proposed land use.</p> <p>4. All cleanup activities shall be performed in accordance with all applicable Federal, State, and local laws and regulations, and required permits shall be secured prior to commencement of construction to the satisfaction of the City and compliance with applicable regulatory agencies such as but not limited to the Encinitas Municipal Code.</p>	



TABLE ES-1: ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES / MITIGATION SUMMARY			
SECTION - ISSUE	IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
4.7.4 - Issue 4	<b>Hazardous Materials – Sites:</b> Impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials would be significant if the project would be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would create a significant hazard to the public or environment.	None	No Impact
4.7.4 - Issue 5	<b>Emergency Response and Evacuation Plans:</b> Impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials would be significant if the project would impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.	None	Less Than Significant Impact
4.7.4 - Issue 6	<b>Wildland Fires:</b> Impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials would be significant if the project would exacerbate the risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas, within brush fire management zones, or where residences are intermixed with wildlands.	None	Less Than Significant Impact
<b>HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY</b>			
4.8.4 - Issues 1 & 6	<b>Water Quality:</b> Impacts related to water quality would be significant if the Project would:  Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade water quality.	None	Less Than Significant Impact
4.8.4 - Issue 2	<b>Groundwater:</b> Impacts related to groundwater would be significant if the Project would:  Substantially deplete ground water supplies or interfere substantially with ground water recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local ground water table level (e.g., the production rate of	None	Less Than Significant Impact

TABLE ES-1: ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES / MITIGATION SUMMARY			
SECTION - ISSUE	IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
	<i>pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted).</i>		
4.8.4 - Issues 3, 4 & 5	<p><b>Drainage Pattern/Runoff:</b> <i>Impacts related to drainage and runoff would be significant if the Project would:</i></p> <p><i>Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in a substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;</i></p> <p><i>Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site; or</i></p> <p><i>Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff.</i></p>	None	Less Than Significant Impact
4.8.4 - Issues 7, 8, 9 & 10	<p><b>Flooding/Inundation:</b> <i>Impacts related to flooding and inundation would be significant if the Project would:</i></p> <p><i>Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or FIRM or other flood hazard delineation map;</i></p> <p><i>Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows;</i></p> <p><i>Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam; or</i></p>	HYD-1 Applications for future development of housing sites consistent with the new zone program, wherein the City has determined a potential for flooding impacts, shall be reviewed by the City for compliance with applicable components of the City’s Floodplain Management Regulations, specifically Section 23.40.051, which includes standards for construction in areas of special flood hazard. All future development on housing sites consistent with the new zone program, located within mapped flood problem areas or dam inundation areas, shall be designed to reduce potential flooding hazards subject to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated

TABLE ES-1: ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES / MITIGATION SUMMARY			
SECTION - ISSUE	IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
	<i>Result in inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.</i>		
<b>LAND USE AND PLANNING</b>			
4.9.4 - Issue 1	<b>Land Use Plans or Policies Plan Consistency:</b> <i>Would the Project conflict with any applicable land use plan or policy of an agency with jurisdiction over the Project?</i>	None	Less Than Significant Impact
4.9.4 - Issue 2	<b>State Planning Initiatives:</b> <i>Would the Project conflict with State Planning Initiatives?</i>	None	Less Than Significant Impact
4.9.4 - Issue 3	<b>Neighborhood Compatibility:</b> <i>Would the Project result in substantial neighborhood compatibility impacts associated with significant traffic, traffic, noise, or aesthetics impacts?</i>	Refer to Transportation and Traffic below.	Significant Unavoidable Impact
4.9.4 - Issue 4	<b>Proximity to Agricultural Sites:</b> <i>Would the Project result in land use conflicts in relation to the proximity of housing to existing agricultural uses/commodity sites (i.e., indirect impacts associated with pesticides, fugitive dust, noise, etc.)?</i>  <i>Would the Project:</i>  a. <i>Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? or</i>  b. <i>Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? (Issue 4)</i>	LU-1 As part of the City’s design review and entitlement process for Candidate Site #9, the City shall require the preparation of a Land Evaluation and Site Assessment (LESA) to determine the significance of development on agricultural resources. Should the LESA determine that site development would result in a significant impact to agricultural resources, the City shall determine if feasible mitigation is available. The absence of feasible mitigation shall not preclude development of Candidate Site #9 consistent with the Housing Element Update.	Significant Unavoidable Impact

<b>TABLE ES-1: ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES / MITIGATION SUMMARY</b>			
<b>SECTION - ISSUE</b>	<b>IMPACTS</b>	<b>MITIGATION MEASURES</b>	<b>SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION</b>
4.9.4 - Issue 5	<b>Noise/Land Use Compatibility:</b> <i>Would the Project result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan?</i>	No mitigation is required.	Less Than Significant Impact
<b>NOISE</b>			
4.10.4 - Issue 1	<b>Ambient Noise Levels:</b> <i>Would the project result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient traffic noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</i>	None	Less Than Significant Impact
4.10.4 - Issue 2 4.10.4 - Issue 3	<b>On-Site Generated Noise:</b> <i>Would the project result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of limits established in the noise ordinance?</i>  <b>Temporary Noise:</b> <i>Would the project result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</i>	No mitigation is required.	Less Than Significant Impact
4.10.4 - Issue 4	<b>Groundborne Noise and Vibration:</b> <i>Would the project result in the generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</i>	None	Less Than Significant Impact
<b>POPULATION AND HOUSING</b>			
4.11.4 - Issue 1	<b>Population Growth:</b> <i>Would the project unduly concentrate population growth to an area not capable of supporting it?</i>	None	Less Than Significant Impact
4.11.4 - Issue 2	<b>Displacement of People:</b> <i>Would the Project displace substantial numbers of existing housing or people through redevelopment, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</i>	None	Less Than Significant Impact

TABLE ES-1: ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES / MITIGATION SUMMARY			
SECTION - ISSUE	IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
<b>PUBLIC SERVICES AND RECREATION</b>			
4.12.4 - Issue 1a	<b>Fire Service:</b> <i>Would the Project promote growth patterns resulting in the need for and/or provision of new or physically altered fire emergency facilities in order to maintain service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives and the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts?</i>	None	Less Than Significant Impact
4.12.4 - Issue 1b	<b>Police Service:</b> <i>Would the Project promote growth patterns resulting in the need for and/or provision of new or physically altered police facilities in order to maintain service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives and the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts?</i>	None	Less Than Significant Impact
4.12.4 - Issue 1c	<b>Schools:</b> <i>Would the Project promote growth patterns resulting in the need for and/or provision of new or physically altered school facilities in order to maintain service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives and the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts?</i>	None	Less Than Significant Impact
4.12.4 - Issue 1d	<b>Library Services:</b> <i>Would the Project promote growth patterns resulting in the need for and/or provision of new or physically altered library facilities in order to maintain service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives and the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts?</i>	None	Less Than Significant Impact
4.12.4 - Issues 2 & 3	<b>Recreation:</b> <i>Would the Project have substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of, or the need for, new or physically altered park and recreation facilities, the construction of which could cause significant</i>	None	Less Than Significant Impact

TABLE ES-1: ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES / MITIGATION SUMMARY			
SECTION - ISSUE	IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
	<i>environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives associated with recreation?</i>		
<b>TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC</b>			
4.13.4 - Issues 1 & 2	<p><b>Circulation System Capacity and Operations:</b> <i>Would the Project result in buildout of land uses, which would generate an increase in projected traffic that is substantial in relation to the capacity of the existing circulation system (with the addition of funded CIP improvements)?</i></p> <p><i>Would the Project conflict with other standards establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?</i></p>	<p><b>TRF-271:</b> <del>Within 12 months after the date the HEU becomes effective, the City shall complete a nexus study and adopt a HEU fee mitigation program, as follows:</del></p> <p><del>a. To establish this mitigation program, the City shall identify the costs associated with feasible traffic improvements identified in Table 4.13-21. Once the costs are established, the City shall undertake a nexus study to identify how the funds will be collected on a per project basis (e.g., by trip generated, unit, etc.). Costs funded may include program administration, project administration and management, design and engineering, regulatory compliance, and construction.</del></p> <p><del>b. Once the HEU traffic mitigation program is established, each project shall contribute its fair share of the traffic improvements as identified in the program prior to Certificate of Occupancy Permit.</del></p> <p><del>c. The City shall deposit the funds in a specific account dedicated for the use of completing the improvements identified in the HEU traffic mitigation program. The funds shall be used exclusively for the purpose of implementing mitigation for the impacts associated with buildout of the HEU however, upon completion of a citywide nexus study, this program could include additional improvements related to multi-modal facilities as well.</del></p>	Significant Unavoidable Impact

TABLE ES-1: ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES / MITIGATION SUMMARY			
SECTION - ISSUE	IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
		<p>d. The City shall complete an annual public report on the HEU traffic mitigation program within 180 days of the completion of the fiscal year pursuant to the Mitigation Fee Act (California Government Code Section 66000 et seq.).</p> <p><u>Prior to approval of discretionary permits for future development at a housing site, a site-specific study shall be conducted for the purposes of determining whether a fair-share contribution is warranted to mitigate any significant traffic impacts resulting from build-out of the development. The study shall be prepared if a Capital Improvement Program has been adopted by the City that includes any of the traffic improvements identified in Table A or if a similar program is approved by Caltrans for future improvements to a roadway facility significantly impacted by the site-specific development’s buildout trips. The fair-share contribution shall be based upon a proportionate share of the development’s build-out trips and shall be subject to the satisfaction of the Development Services Department or Caltrans, as applicable. The fair-share contribution, if warranted, shall be made a condition of project approval and collected prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy Permit.</u></p>	
4.13.4 - Issue 3	<b>Alternative Transportation Modes:</b> <i>Would the Project conflict with the City’s adopted General or Specific Plan policies supporting alternative transportation modes (e.g., bus turnouts, trolley extensions, bicycle lanes, bicycles racks, etc.)?</i>	None	Less Than Significant Impact

TABLE ES-1: ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES / MITIGATION SUMMARY			
SECTION - ISSUE	IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
4.13.4 - Issues 4 & 5	<p><b>Traffic Hazards and Emergency Access:</b> <i>Would the project result in an increase in traffic hazards for motor vehicles, bicyclists, or pedestrians?</i></p> <p><i>Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?</i></p>	None	Less Than Significant Impact
<b>PUBLIC UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS</b>			
4.14.4 - Issue 1a	<p><b>Stormwater System:</b> <i>Would the Project result in a need for new systems, or require substantial alterations to existing stormwater infrastructure, the construction of which would create physical impacts?</i></p>	None	Less Than Significant Impact
4.14.4 - Issues 1b & 3	<p><b>Wastewater:</b> <i>Would the Project:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Result in a need for new systems, or require substantial alterations to existing utilities, including wastewater, or reclaimed water infrastructure, the construction of which would create physical impacts?</i></li> <li><i>Result in a demand for wastewater treatment such that local wastewater treatment provider(s) have inadequate capacity to serve Project buildout in addition to the provider's existing commitments and new or expanded facilities are needed?</i></li> </ul>	None	Less Than Significant Impact
4.14.4 - Issue 1c	<p><b>Water System:</b> <i>Would the Project require or result in the construction of new water facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</i></p>	None	Less Than Significant Impact
4.14.4 - Issue 2	<p><b>Water Supply:</b> <i>Would the Project require or result in the need for new water supply entitlements and resources?</i></p>	None	Significant Unavoidable Impact
4.14.4 - Issue 4	<p><b>Solid Waste Disposal:</b> <i>Would the Project:</i></p>	None	Less Than Significant Impact



TABLE ES-1: ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES / MITIGATION SUMMARY			
SECTION - ISSUE	IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Be served by a landfill without sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the Project's waste disposal needs; or</i></li> <li>• <i>Not comply with the Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations regarding solid waste?</i></li> </ul>		