

**ERRATA TO THE  
FINAL CITY OF ENCINITAS HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE  
PROGRAM ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

**State Clearinghouse No. 2015041044**

**May 12, 2016**

In response to public comments, the text of the Draft EIR has been modified and indicated in underline and strikeout format as follows:

~~Old Text~~      Revised Text

The Final EIR is organized in the same manner as the Draft EIR, as each section of the document has retained the same section number. Immediately following this Errata are the comments and responses to the Draft EIR. Following the comments and responses is the revised Draft EIR. Where changes in the text have been made in response to comments on the Draft EIR, such changes are noted in the responses.

Changes to the Draft EIR are limited to the following sections:

**Global Changes** –Several global editorial changes have been made throughout the Draft EIR:

- The proposed General Plan land use designation and zoning nomenclature have been slightly modified. Details regarding the changes can be found in Section 3.4.2 of the EIR. There are no new impacts associated with buildout of the HEU than previously considered in the Draft EA/EIR as a result of this refinement in response to the public process. Globally, “HEU floating zone” or “floating zone” has been revised to read: “new zone” in the Final EIR.
- The description of housing site ALT-5 has been revised throughout the EIR to reflect that the site is currently vacant and the previously reported homes have been demolished.
- The description of housing site ALT-4 has been revised throughout the EIR to reflect that it also includes housing site O-6; not O-4.

**Executive Summary**

Section S.5.2.1 was revised to add Rural Residential-1 (RR-1) zoning information to Viable Housing Site L-7.

Table S-1 includes editorial changes to the ‘results of impact analysis’ and ‘impact level after mitigation’ columns to include impact conclusions to housing strategies 1-3 and the SMUP Alternative. Editorial revisions were made to the ‘mitigation measure’ column to reflect revised sections of the Final EIR from Sections 4.1 through 4.14.

**Introduction**

Section 1.2.3.1, Organization and Content includes the following chapter addition:

Chapter 13.0 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program specifies what the programmatic mitigation is, the entity responsible for monitoring the program, and when in the process it should be accomplished.

**Environmental Setting**

Section 2.2 has been revised to include La Costa Avenue as a major east-west connector.

Section 2.4.3.7 includes the following clarifications:

Locally, Vulcan Street, San Elijo Avenue, Saxony Road, Quail Hollow Drive, Quail Gardens Drive, ~~Gardens Drive~~, Westlake Drive, Nardo Road, MacKinnon Avenue, Villa Cardiff Drive, Balour Drive, Lake Drive, Garden View Road, Via Cantebria, ~~Forrest Bluff~~, ...

**Project Description**

Section 3.2.2.3. The description of housing site OE-1 has been corrected. The correct gross acreage is 2.3.

Section 3.4.2. The Housing Element Implementation Section (General Plan Land Use Map Amendment and Rezone Program) has been revised. The revisions represent a further refinement of the first draft approach to the General Plan land use designation and new zone, based on public comment. The revisions include:

The new General Plan land use designation, AHE, is composed of two parts: the current land use under the adopted General Plan (first generation) and the new land use pursuant to the HEU (second generation). The new AHE land use designation is purposefully flexible. It allows a one-way transition from the presently adopted General Plan land use designation to the AHE designation. Existing land uses that conform to the General Plan at the time of HEU adoption can be retained. However, once an application for development consistent with the second generation AHE land use is approved, the previous (first generation) land use can no longer be implemented. (Refer to Appendix F-1 for the AHE General Plan land use designation.)

The new zone would allow the first generation of use and development standards to continue from the zone that was in effect prior to adoption of the HEU. The new zone

includes the new, second generation use and development standards, along with unique processes and findings, which accommodate residential and mixed uses between 20 and 30 units per acre. The new zone includes three character contexts and three design contexts. The new zone allows for an intensification of land use, height, and density. (Refer to Appendix Q for site-specific details pertaining to the new zone). Minor changes were made to Table 3-3 to reflect the revised zoning nomenclature.

### **Aesthetics**

Section 4.1.7. The description of housing site ALT-4 includes the following clarification:

The site would be zoned Residential Village Center (R30-V).

### **Air Quality**

Section 4.2.5.3, mitigation measure AQ-1 includes the following editorial revision:

Prior to the next update of the regional housing needs assessment and within six months of . . . .

### **Biological Resources**

Section 4.3.1.5 includes the following clarification regarding wildlife movement corridors:

A majority of the housing sites are of limited value for wildlife movement and corridors due to existing residential and commercial development. The following housing sites are, in part, adjacent to undeveloped land; however, they are not identified as regionally significant wildlife corridors by the Encinitas Subarea Plan (2001): ALT-4, ALT-5, C-6, C-7, NE-1, O-2, O-4, O-6, and OE-1. However, these sites do not connect suitable wildlife habitat areas as they are fragmented by roads and other development. Although these housing sites ~~may~~ provide for local wildlife movement, these housing sites are primarily constrained by roads and development and would are not located within ~~constitute~~ a significant regional wildlife movement corridor.

However, one housing site, O-45, is located within a focused planning area identified by the Encinitas Subarea Plan (2001). Though housing site O-45 is constrained by development and roads to the north and south, it is traversed by Escondido Creek along the eastern boundary of the site. This area of Escondido Creek is identified as a biological resource and core linkage by the Encinitas Subarea Plan (2001), and thus is considered a significant regional wildlife corridor. However, this area is permanently conserved in open space by a conservation easement, and thus is not considered developable area.”

Section 4.3.7.3. The Mitigation Framework for BIO-5 includes the following addition:

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 place, and appropriate monitoring and maintenance must be implemented during the grading period.

Section 4.3.8.1. The following clarifications were made regarding wildlife movement corridor impacts:

A portion of housing site O-4 contains an area of Escondido Creek that is identified by the Encinitas Subarea Plan (2001) as a regionally significant wildlife movement corridor; however, as this area is permanently conserved in open space by a conservation easement, it would not be impacted by future development in accordance with the HEU. Therefore, implementation of the HEU would not interfere with any a regionally significant wildlife corridor . . . . No conclusions regarding impacts were made.

## **Cultural Resources**

Section 4.4.6.3. Mitigation Framework CUL-2 includes the following revisions:

Prior to the issuance of any permit for future development consistent with the ~~HEU floating-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 resources and the need for project impact mitigation by preservation, relocation, or other methods. 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. and—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.

Section 4.4.7, the question for Issue 3 includes an editorial revision:

Allow development to occur that could significantly impact a unique paleontological resource or a geologic formation possessing a moderate to high fossil bearing potential? Result in the disturbance of any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

Section 4.4.8, the question for Issue 4 includes an editorial revision:

Result in the disturbance of any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? ~~Allow development to occur that could significantly impact a unique paleontological resource or a geologic formation possessing a moderate to high fossil bearing potential?~~

### **Greenhouse Gas Emissions**

Section 4.6.5 and Table 4.6-7. The GHG emissions for each housing strategy have been revised to reflect updated emissions projections (refer to Appendix L-2). Emissions for each housing strategy are incrementally less than previously disclosed due to an increase in renewable energy sources utilized by SDG&E. No new impacts would result.

Section 4.6.5.3 has been revised to include the following mitigation measures:

~~Applications for future development of housing sites consistent with the HEU floating zone program shall be required to comply with the following mitigation framework:~~

**GHG-2:** To mitigate citywide GHG impacts at the program-level, the City shall adopt a qualified climate action plan within 20 months after the date the HEU becomes effective. The climate action plan shall contain the following components:

1. The City's goals for reducing GHG emissions consistent with the statewide reduction goals outlined in Assembly Bill (AB) 32 and expressed in Executive Orders S-03-05, and B-30-15;
2. Quantified community and municipal GHG emissions inventories for a baseline year and business as usual emissions through 2050;
3. Identification of emission reduction required to meet GHG emissions targets as established by the California Air Resources Board's Climate Change Scoping Plan and related statewide policies and regulations;

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 meet or exceed the established GHG reduction targets in line with statewide goals expressed in AB 32 and Executive Order B-30-15.

The timeline for preparation and adoption of the climate action plan shall include the following milestones:

- Project Initiation/Public Scoping Meetings – 2 Months
- Inventories and forecasts – 2 Months
- Outreach and Public Scoping Meetings – 2 Months
- Reduction Measures and Projections – 2 Months
- Document Preparation – 2 Months
- Environmental – 6 Months
- Public Review – 1 Month
- Response to Comments and Certification – 1 Month
- Commission and City Council Public Hearings – 2 Months

Upon completion 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.

**GHG-3:** Until the adoption of a qualified climate action plan (or in the event a climate action plan is not adopted), all discretionary projects that exceed the CAPCOA 900 MT CO<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 4.6-10. The project-level analysis shall demonstrate that, with implementation of the mitigation measures identified in Table 4.6-10 that are applicable to the project, the project will not impede the implementation of AB 32 or Executive Order B-30-15.

~~GHG-2: Demonstrate compliance with CalGreen Tier II standards.~~

~~GHG-3: Multi-family residential development shall provide energy star appliances, including refrigerators, stoves, and dishwashers.~~

~~GHG-4: Include 1 electric vehicle charging station for every 50 parking spaces.~~

~~GHG-5: Demonstrate a 25 percent reduction in outdoor water use.~~ “

Table 4.6-10, Menu of Potential Project-Level GHG Reduction Measures, in Section 4.6.5.3 has been added to supplement mitigation measure GHG-3.

## **Land Use**

Table 4.9-16 has been updated to reflect the final version of the Traffic Impact Study dated April 2016 (Appendix N). This included revising the speeds on segments of Vulcan Avenue and Quail Hollow Drive and existing volumes on I-5. Roadway segment names were also revised to be consistent with the Traffic Impact Study dated April 2016.

Tables 4.9-18, 4.9-19, and 4.9-20 have been updated with the revised contour distances for Vulcan Avenue and Quail Hollow Drive that were calculated due to revised speeds on these segments. Roadway segment names were also revised to be consistent with the Traffic Impact Study dated April 2016. No changes in impacts would result.

## **Noise**

Tables 4.10-7, 4.10-8, and 4.10-9 have been updated with the revised noise levels for Vulcan Avenue and Quail Hollow Drive, which were calculated due to revised speeds on these segments. Roadway segment names were also revised to be consistent with the Traffic Impact Study dated April 2016. No changes in impacts would result.

Appendix O, Noise Modeling and Methodology, has been updated to reflect the revised speeds on segments of Vulcan Avenue and Quail Hollow Drive, revised existing volumes on I-5, and roadway segment names.

## **Transportation/Traffic**

Section 4.13.1.1. Editorial revisions to the EIR were completed to clarify information on Quail Gardens Drive.

Section 4.13.1.1 was updated to state Nardo Road having bike route signs once.

Section 4.13.5. Figure call-outs have been revised as follows: “Figures 4.13-~~32~~ to 4.13-~~65~~ illustrate the year 2035 . . . of each of the three housing strategies. One new figure was added: Figure 4.13-6 illustrates the year 2035 ADT and LOS in the no project scenario.”

The following tables have been revised in the Final Traffic Impact Study (Appendix N) and Final EIR:

Table 4.13-1 – Existing Roadway Segment Level of Service, has been revised to be consistent with the Traffic Impact Study dated April 2016.

Table 4.13-11 – Housing Strategy 1 (Ready Made) – Future Year 2035 Roadway Segment Level of Service Analysis. The roadway segment of Manchester Avenue from Encinitas Boulevard to El Camino Real was added. Manchester Avenue was clarified as a roadway segment, and the V/C data for La Costa Avenue from North Coast Highway 101 to Vulcan Avenue was revised. The ADT for Encinitas Boulevard from Vulcan Avenue to I-5 SB Ramps was updated. The Birmingham Drive roadway from I-5 SB Ramps to I-5 NB Ramps was updated for the Year 2035 No Project.

Table 4.13-12 – Housing Strategy 1 (Ready Made) – Future Year 2035 Freeway Segment Level of Service. Revisions have been made to the Year 2035 (No Project) ADT and Peak Hour Volume data to be consistent with the Traffic Impact Study dated April 2016.

Table 4.13-13 – Housing Strategy 2 (Build Your Own) – Future Year 2035 Roadway Segment Level of Service Analysis. Revisions have been made for Birmingham Drive for the V/C of the Year 2035 No Project and to the LOS of the Year 2035 + Strategy 2. Revisions were made to be consistent with the Traffic Impact Study dated April 2016.

Table 4.13-14 – Housing Strategy 2 (Build Your Own) – Future Year 2035 Freeway Segment Level of Service. ADT and Peak Hour Volume information have been revised. Revisions were made to be consistent with the Traffic Impact Study dated April 2016.

Table 4.13-15 – Housing Strategy 3 (Modified Mixed Uses Places) – Future Year 2035 Roadway Segment Level of Service Analysis. Revisions were made to be consistent with the Traffic Impact Study dated April 2016.

Table 4.13-16 – Housing Strategy 3 (Modified Mixed Use Places). Future Year 2035 Freeway Segment Level of Service. ADT and Peak Hour Volume information for the Year 2035 No Project have been revised. Revisions were made to be consistent with the Traffic Impact Study dated April 2016.

Table 4.13-21 – Traffic Mitigation Improvements includes the following revisions:

Impacts TRF-24, TRF-25, and TRF-26: ~~The City of Encinitas shall work with Caltrans to adjust the ramp meter rate. The City of Encinitas shall coordinate with Caltrans to increase ramp capacity at these impacted on-ramp locations; such improvement could include additional lanes, interchange reconfiguration, etc.~~ Feasibility: Potentially Feasible ~~Infeasible~~ ~~is located within another jurisdiction~~

The Mitigation Framework includes the following revisions:

TRF-27: Within 12 months after the date the HEU becomes effective ~~of the public vote on the housing plan~~, the City shall complete a nexus study and adopt a HEU floating zone fee mitigation program, as follows:



- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.).

A new mitigation measure has been added to Final EIR to address impacts to Caltrans facilities:

TRF-28: Within 12 months of the effective date of the HEU, the City shall enter into a Traffic Mitigation Agreement with Caltrans for implementation of the necessary improvements identified in Table 4.13-21. Payment of fair-share fees shall be determined based on the increase in freeway traffic directly attributable buildout of the HEU.

Although the implementation of TRF-24 through TRF-26 could reduce the potential significant impacts to ramp facilities, the HEU's impacts to freeway ramps would require certain actions for the design and implementation of the improvements, which are within the jurisdiction of Caltrans, not the City of Encinitas. Because the City cannot ensure that the mitigation necessary to avoid or reduce the impacts to a level below significance will occur prior to construction of any or all of the housing sites, the HEU's cumulative impacts on freeway ramp operations at the I-5 southbound ramp at Encinitas Boulevard, the I-5 northbound ramp at Encinitas Boulevard, and the I-5 southbound on-ramp at Santa Fe Drive are considered significant and unmitigated.

As identified in TRF-27 and TRF-28, this mitigation framework ~~program~~ would provide the City of Encinitas with a mechanism for financing the implementation of the identified improvements required to mitigate cumulative impacts of the HEU through future year 2035. The program would assign a fair-share transportation impact fee to development projects based on a nexus between the cost to implement all proposed circulation improvements and the number of net new trips. Such a program would be consistent with the City's General Plan Goal 2 to "make every effort to develop a varied transportation system that is capable of serving both the existing population and future residents while preserving community values and character" as well as Goal 7 that requires development to "provide for all costs of the incremental expansion of the circulation system necessary to accommodate that development."

Section 4.13.5.4 includes the following revision:

Mitigation measures which are determined to be feasible improvements as indicated in Table 4.13-21, would reduce traffic impacts of the HEU to below a level of significance if these improvements can be assured at the time of future development. However, as the City has not yet approved a mitigation fee program for the HEU as identified in TRF-27, there is no assurance that funding will be available to construct these improvements at the time future development is proposed. Until such time as this program is implemented, impacts would remain significant and unmitigated. Likewise, impacts to Caltrans ramp facilities would remain significant and unmitigated because the City cannot ensure that the mitigation necessary to avoid or reduce the impacts to a level below significance will occur prior to construction of any or all of the housing sites.

The following figures have been revised and added to the Final Traffic Impact Study and Final EIR:

Figure 4.13-1 – Existing Roadway Network

Figure 4.13-2 – Existing Roadway ADT and LOS and Intersection LOS (added to Final EIR).

Figure 4.13-3 – Year 2035 + Housing Strategy 1 (RM) – Roadway ADT and LOS

Figure 4.13-4 - Year 2035 + Housing Strategy 2 (BYO) – Roadway ADT and LOS

Figure 4.13-5 - Year 2035 + Housing Strategy 3 (MMUP) – Roadway ADT and LOS

Figure 4.13-6 - Year 2035 + No Project – Roadway ADT and LOS

---

**Significant Unavoidable Environmental Effects/Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes/Energy Conservation**

Section 5.3.1 includes the following revisions to reflect additional GHG mitigation measures in Section 4.6:

The HEU does not automatically allow or permit housing projects. Individual development projects in the City ... local energy and building regulations. Furthermore, as mitigation for HEU greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) impacts at the program-level, the City would adopt a qualified climate action plan within 20 months after the date the HEU becomes effective (as detailed in Section 4.6.5, mitigation measure GHG-2). GHG reduction measures would consist of project-level implementation measures, as well as city-wide policies, standards, and programs. The project-level and city-wide measures will be designed to achieve emissions reductions that would meet or exceed the established GHG reduction targets in line with statewide goals expressed in AB 32 and Executive Order B-30-15. Adoption of a climate action plan would further reduce energy consumption associated with long-term operations of projects consistent with the HEU.

The HEU would be consistent with various energy efficiency goals and policies within the City's General Plan. ~~Additionally,~~ State and Federal codes and standards also will assist the City's goal of encouraging the reduction of energy and GHG emissions during the design and building phases of future development construction-projects (see Table 4.6-11~~0~~ in Section 4.6, Greenhouse Gas Emissions). Furthermore, future projects would be required to demonstrate consistency with the City's updated climate action plan or prepare a project-specific GHG analysis that identifies project-specific GHG reduction measures. GHG reduction measures that may be applied at the future project-level include, but are not limited to those identified in Table 4.6-10, in Section 4.6.5 of the EIR).

Section 5.3.1.2 includes the following editorial revision:

Additionally, as mitigation for the HEU, the City will prepare a qualified climate action plan. All future development within the City will be required to demonstrate compliance with GHG reduction measures as identified in the CAP. Impacts relative to the inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary consumption of energy would be less than significant.

## Cumulative Impacts

Section 7.2.6 includes the following editorial revisions, reflective of changes in Section 4.6:

“Overall, until the anticipated growth under the HEU is included in the emission estimates of the Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS), impacts relative to conformance with the SCS would be cumulatively significant and unavoidable. In addition to compliance with State and local regulations, as mitigation for the increase in GHG emissions under the HEU, the City would prepare an updated climate action plan (CAP) (refer to Mitigation Framework GHG-2). The CAP would serve as a city-wide program to reduce GHG emissions from both existing and future development. Future projects would be required to demonstrate compliance with the CAP to implement Mitigation Measures GHG-1 through GHG-6 to address GHG emissions impacts. Until the updated CAP is adopted, mitigation measure GHG-3 would apply to all projects consistent with the HEU zone program. While the proposed mitigation framework would reduce ~~project~~ GHG emissions associated with buildout of the HEU, GHG emissions reductions cannot be adequately quantified at this time. Therefore, this impact would be cumulatively significant and unavoidable.

## Project Alternatives

Table 9-1 was updated to correct misprints and mathematical errors on the No Project Alternative and the Sustainable Mixed Use Places Alternative. These revisions do not result in substantive changes to the analysis.

Section 9.3.1 includes the following clarification:

Consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(3)(A), the No Project Alternative represents the continued implementation of the adopted General Plan Land Use and zoning for the housing sites. The adopted General Plan land use plan is shown on Figure 9-2. Under the No Project Alternative, the Housing Element update would not be adopted, and the City would remain out of conformance with State law.

The following editorial revisions have been made to Table 9-2 and 9-3. No changes were made to the analysis.

Cultural Resources Issue 2: Archaeological Resources in Table 9-2 has been revised from SM (Significant and Unavoidable) to SU (Significant and Unavoidable) for Housing Strategies 1-3.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions Issue 1: GHG Emissions in Table 9-2 has been revised from SAME to LESS for the SMUP Alternative.

Transportation/Traffic Issues 1 and 2: Circulation System Capacity and Operations in Table 9-2 has been revised from SAME to LESS for the SMUP Alternative.

Table 9-3, SMUP Alternative: Matrix Comparison of the Housing Sites and Significant Mitigated (SM)/Significant Unavoidable (SU) Impacts has been revised to include “SU” for Impact AQ:1 Consistency with RAQs and Impact LU:3 Neighborhood Compatibility.

Section 9.3.1 has been revised to reflect changes to the Greenhouse Gas Emissions analysis in Section 4.6.

No Project Alternative Issue 1: GHG Emissions:

Buildout under the HEU would yield a greater amount of density and intensity of use, potentially resulting in greater GHG emissions than under the Adopted General Plan. However, the HEU ~~also~~ provides for a more efficient land use pattern and would reduce vehicle miles travelled (VMT) compared to the No Project Alternative (refer to Section 4.9.6). Pursuant to Assembly Bill 32, all future development would adhere to the California Energy Code requiring projects to show improvements in energy efficiency based on the relevant updated Code. The 2013 Code update achieves an average of 23 percent energy efficiency improvement over the 2008 Energy Code; and the 2016 update is anticipated to achieve an average 28 percent increase in energy efficiency over the 2013 Energy Code. ~~However, a~~ As mitigation for the increase in GHG emissions under the HEU, the City would prepare an updated climate action plan (refer to Mitigation Framework GHG-2). The climate action plan would serve as a city-wide program to reduce GHG emissions from both existing and future development. Preparation of an updated climate action plan could not be ensured under the No Project Alternative. However, at the program-level, under either the adopted General Plan or HEU, construction future project details are unknown, and . . . .

No Project Alternative Greenhouse Gas Emission Issue 2: Consistency with GHG Plans, Policies, and Regulations:

Impacts related to consistency with GHG plans, policies, and regulations from the No Project Alternative would be greater than the HEU. The No Project Alternative would not comply with the CARB Scoping Plan ~~and SCS~~. It would work against regional and statewide efforts to reduce GHG emissions, such as Senate Bill 375 and San Diego Forward (the Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy) because it would not work to reduce VMT...

Section 9.3.1. Transportation/Traffic Issues 1 and 2: Circulation System Capacity and Operations includes the following revision:

Future development under the HEU would be reviewed for consistency with this PEIR ~~and compliance with the mitigation framework therein. Implementation of mitigation measures (on a project basis) would likely reduce direct traffic impacts for development of housing sites under both the No Project Alternative and the HEU. . The fee . . .~~

Section 9.3.2.1 has been revised to include greater detail about the land use designations and zoning for the SMUP Alternative:

c. General Plan Designations and Zoning

The sites that comprise the SMUP Alternative would be rezoned as proposed in Chapter 3. A summary of the At Home in Encinitas General Plan land use designation and new zone design and community character contexts are provided in Table 9-6 below.

Section 9.3.2 has been revised to reflect the changes to Section 4.6. Greenhouse Gas Emissions Issue 1 in Section 9.3 includes the following editorial revisions:

Impacts related to GHG emissions from future development under the SMUP Alternative would be relatively the same as the HEU housing strategies. Buildout under the three HEU housing strategies and the SMUP Alternative would yield similar amounts of density and intensity of use, resulting in higher GHG emissions than the existing condition. The SMUP Alternative would, however, result in fewer trips than any of the housing strategies under the HEU (refer to Traffic, below); therefore, vehicular GHG emissions would be incrementally less. Future development under all three housing strategies and the SMUP Alternative would implement similar mitigation measures to reduce GHG emissions. However, at the program-level, under ~~either any strategy, plan, construction~~ future project details are unknown, and impacts would remain significant and unmitigated. Therefore, impacts relative to GHG emissions under the SMUP Alternative would be the same as the HEU.

Section 9.3.2. Transportation/Traffic Issue 1 and 2 has been revised to include Table 9-7, Trip Generation Comparison, and the following revisions:

The SMUP Alternative generates fewer daily trips than housing strategies 1-3 (see Table 9 7). ~~the most intense HEU strategy (MMUP), but a greater number of trips than under housing strategy 1 (RM) or 2 (BYO).~~ Impacts related to circulation system capacity and operations from the SMUP Alternative would be less than under any of the housing strategies (refer to Appendix P for detailed traffic analysis of the SMUP Alternative) the HEU (MMUP), but incrementally greater than under housing strategies 1 (RM) and 2 (BYO). As identified in Section 4.13.1.2, multiple roadway (and freeway) segments and intersections throughout the City currently operate at substandard LOS E or F. Increased traffic under the ~~SMUP Reduced~~ Alternative would further degrade conditions similar to the HEU strategies. However, the SMUP Alternative would result in fewer roadway segment, intersection, and freeway ramp facilities impacts than other housing strategies (see Table 9-8).

Table 9-8, Traffic Impact Comparison Table, was added to Section 9.3.2.along with the following revisions:

Future development under the HEU would be reviewed for consistency with this PEIR and compliance with the mitigation framework therein. ~~Likewise, similar mitigation measures to that proposed under the HEU would be required for development under the~~

---

~~SMUP Alternative.~~ The following mitigation measures, also identified in Table 4.13-21, would be required under the SMUP Alternative:

- Roadway Segments: TRF-4, TRF-5, TRF-6, TRF-7, TRF-9, TRF-10
- Intersections: TRF-22 and TRF-23
- Freeway Ramps: TRF-26

In addition, program-wide mitigation measures TRF-27 and TRF-28 would be required to fund the physical improvements, as under the other housing strategies. Implementation of the mitigation framework would reduce traffic impacts under the HEU and SMUP Alternative; however, not to a level less than significant-level. Therefore, while impacts relative to circulation system capacity and operations under the SMUP Alternative would be less under the SMUP alternative, impacts would still be significant and unavoidable, the same as the HEU.

Section 9.3.2.2 includes the following revisions:

The SMUP Alternative would incrementally reduce significant impacts associated with aesthetics, air quality, biological resources (sensitive wildlife/vegetation species and wetlands), cultural/paleontological resources, land use (neighborhood compatibility; ~~and~~ proximity to agricultural sites), hazardous materials, ~~and~~ hydrology, and traffic (capacity and operations) compared to the HEU housing strategies (refer to Table 9-2). Although traffic impacts would remain significant and unavoidable for the HEU, the SMUP Alternative would reduce traffic impacts on several roadway segments, intersections, and freeway ramps ~~through a reduction in trip generation~~. This alternative . . . .

Section 9.4 includes the following revisions:

The SMUP Alternative is considered the environmentally superior alternative, because it would incrementally reduce significant impacts associated with aesthetics, air quality, biological resources (sensitive wildlife/vegetation species and wetlands), cultural/paleontological resources, land use (neighborhood compatibility; ~~and~~ proximity to agricultural sites), hazardous materials, ~~and~~ hydrology, and traffic (capacity and operations) compared to the project's HEU housing strategies (refer to Table 9-2). Although traffic impacts would remain . . . .

### **Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program**

Chapter 13, Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, is a new chapter that has been added to the Final EIR and specifies what the programmatic mitigation is; the entity responsible for monitoring the program; and when in the process it should be accomplished. Table 13-1 summarizes the MMRP for the HEU under the jurisdiction of the City.

**Individuals and Agencies Consulted**

The following agency has been added:

Caltrans District 11: Jacob Armstrong, Chief, Development Review Branch

**Appendices****Appendix B**

Minor editorial revisions have been made to Appendix B, Housing Site Summaries.

**Appendix F-1**

Appendix F-1 has been revised to reflect changes in the proposed General Plan land use designations/nomenclature for the HEU.

**Appendix F-2**

Appendix F-2, the proposed zoning code for the Chapter 30.36 At Home in Encinitas Zone: For Transitioning to Mixed Use and Multi-Family Residential has been replaced with a revised draft, dated May 02, 2016.

**Appendix H**

Appendix H has been revised to reflect changes in the proposed General Plan land use designations and zoning nomenclature for the HEU.

**Appendix L-1**

Appendix L-1 was formerly Appendix L in the Draft EIR (Greenhouse Gas Methodology and Modeling). Appendix L-1 has been revised to remove the discussion on the Business-As-Usual modeling methodology.

**Appendix L-2**

Appendix L-2, Supplemental GHG Information, is a new appendix that has been added in response to public comments. Additional GHG emissions, additional calculations, and additional analysis of the City's climate action plan have been performed to support the information provided in the EIR prepared for the HEU.

**Appendix M**

Appendix M has been revised to reflect changes in the proposed General Plan land use designations and zoning nomenclature for the HEU.

**Appendix N**

Appendix N includes the revised report for the Traffic Impact Study and associated Appendices completed for the City of Encinitas Housing Element, dated April 20, 2016.



**Appendix O**

Appendix O, Noise Modeling and Methodology, has been updated to reflect the revised speeds on segments of Vulcan Avenue and Quail Hollow Drive, revised existing volumes on I-5, and roadway segment names.

**Appendix P**

Appendix P is the new Sustainable Mixed Use Places “SMUP” Housing Strategy Alternative Traffic Technical Report included as part of the Final EIR. The SMUP Alternative TIS report is dated May 3, 2016, and contains the traffic impact analysis and associated appendices for the SMUP analysis.

**Appendix Q**

Appendix Q contains details regarding the new At Home in Encinitas Zone, along with four maps illustrating the application of the new zone within each of the three HEU mapping strategies and the SMUP Alternative.