

## CHAPTER 6.0 LANE DIET ANALYSIS

### 6.1 Introduction

This Chapter addresses the “Lane Diet” project (lane restriping) between Leucadia Boulevard and La Costa Avenue, which was completed in 2012 as part of the City’s Annual Pavement Rehabilitation Project for FY 2012/13. The Lane Diet included painting one “through” vehicle lane and a Class II bike lane in the northbound direction, thereby eliminating a northbound vehicle lane by turning it into a dedicated bike lane; and a “through” vehicle lane and a shared vehicle/bicycle lane in the SB direction.

This Lane Diet project is addressed in this EIR because, a Local Coastal Program (LCP) Amendment is being sought retroactively as an additional discretionary action to be taken to the City Council along with the discretionary approvals for the proposed Project (see Table 2-8, Matrix of Required Approvals and Permits). In addition to City approval, a LCP Amendment for the Lane Diet Project must be approved by the California Coastal Commission (CCC). The basis for this action originated from CCC’s review of the City’s GPA/LCP Amendment/N101SP Amendment applications (Case No. 10-036 GPA/ LCPA/ N101SPA) and Coastal Development Permit (CDP) application (Case No. 10-035 DR/CDP) for the proposed Streetscape Project application submitted on March 15, 2010. Specifically, the CCC commented on January 23, 2013 (Appendix B, Project Chronology) that the Lane Diet project was not exempt from CDP requirements, and that it should be considered together with the proposed Streetscape Project as a “comprehensive project.” As such, the CCC commented “that the City first process an LCP amendment for the comprehensive project, which may include roundabouts, reverse angle and parallel parking, and reductions of portions of northbound Highway 101 from two lanes to one lane, and then process a CDP which will be appealable to the CCC both due to partial location in the appeals area and as a major public works project.”

Based on evaluation of traffic volume data in a January 5, 2010 Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) prepared by Linscott, Law & Greenspan, City staff determined there were no operational concerns (i.e., traffic impacts) related to the Lane Diet project. Nevertheless, in a March 6, 2014 memorandum (Appendix B), City staff agreed to modify the above-referenced CDP application acknowledging that the elimination of a northbound vehicle lane by restriping it as a dedicated Class II bike lane should be evaluated to determine if there would be any operational concerns related to this action. This Chapter provides a comprehensive environmental analysis of the Lane Diet project, in accordance with the *State CEQA Guidelines*, to support the required CEQA Findings associated with a separate LCP Amendment action for consideration by City Council along with the discretionary approvals for the proposed Project. The CEQA “baseline” condition for this Lane Diet project analysis includes the original four-lane roadway prior to the Lane Diet project.

#### 6.1.1 Analysis of Project Effects and Determination as to Significance

##### 6.1.1.1 Aesthetics

A project would generally be considered to have a significant effect if it would:

1. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.

## 6.0 LANE DIET ANALYSIS

---

2. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway.
3. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.
4. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

### Analysis

#### **Issue 1: Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.**

The Lane Diet project involved lane restriping and installation of “sharrows” in the NB and SB lanes which did not result in a substantial change in the existing visual setting. Those drivers along the road who were familiar with the circulation patterns were likely to observe a minor change to the views of the road configuration they were used to experiencing; however, those unfamiliar with the area would not have noticed a change. Such improvements would generally not have been visible to viewers on adjacent streets or on surrounding lands. Additionally, the lane restriping did not result in construction or removal of any physical structures or other physical elements that would contribute to the visual appearance of the corridor. Due to the limited nature of these improvements, the Lane Diet project did not substantially obstruct, interrupt, or detract from a valued focal and/or panoramic vista from a public road, a trail within an adopted County or State trail system, a scenic vista or highway, or a recreational area.

#### **Issue 2: Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway.**

The visual change along the Project corridor from restriping of the original four-lane roadway did not result in a substantial change to the visual setting. Those drivers along the roadway who were familiar with the circulation patterns were likely to observe a minor change to views of the roadway configuration they were used to experiencing; however, those unfamiliar with the area would not have noticed a change. Additionally, the lane restriping did not result in construction of or removal of any physical structures within the corridor. No removal of trees or disturbance of historic resources occurred with the improvements. Therefore, the Lane Diet project did not substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to trees and historic buildings within a State scenic highway.

#### **Issue 3: Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings**

The visual change along the corridor resulting from restriping of the original four-lane roadway did not result in a substantial change to the visual setting. Those drivers along the roadway who were familiar with the circulation patterns were likely to observe a minor change to the views of the roadway configuration they were used to experiencing; however, those unfamiliar with the area would not have noticed a change. Additionally, the lane restriping did not result in construction of or removal of any physical structures within the corridor. No removal of trees or disturbance of historic resources occurred with the improvements. Therefore, the Lane Diet project did not substantially degrade the existing visual quality or character of the Project corridor.

**Issue 4: Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.**

No changes in existing land uses or structures along the Project corridor occurred as a result of the lane restriping, and therefore, no new land uses or intensification of existing land uses that may have resulted in new sources of light or glare occurred. No alterations to existing, or addition of new, streetlights within the corridor were made as part of the lane restriping. Therefore, the Lane Diet project did not create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

**Cumulative Aesthetics Resources Impacts**

The lane restriping did not result in significant impacts to visual quality because fast drying, roadway paint was used. Therefore, in combination with the cumulative projects identified in Figure 2-2, Local Vicinity Map, the Lane Diet project did not result in cumulatively considerable visual quality impacts.

**6.1.1.2 Agricultural and Forestry Resources**

A project would generally be considered to have a significant effect if it would:

1. 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.
2. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract.
3. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g)).
4. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.
5. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use.

Analysis**Issue 1: 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.**

As illustrated on the California Department of Conservation (CDC) Important Farmland Map for San Diego County (CDC 2010), the majority of the Project corridor is classified as urban and built-up land. As noted on the 2010 Important Farmlands Map, there are no lands within or adjacent to the Project corridor that are designated Prime, Unique or Farmland of Statewide/Local Importance. Therefore, the Lane Diet project did not result in the conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Important Farmland to non-agricultural uses.

## 6.0 LANE DIET ANALYSIS

---

### **Issue 2: Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract.**

#### Zoning

As illustrated on the City's E-Zoning,<sup>1</sup> none of the parcels within the Project corridor are zoned for agricultural use. Therefore, the Lane Diet project did not conflict with agricultural zoned lands.

#### Williamson Act Contract

According to the *2013-14 Williamson Act Map for San Diego County*,<sup>2</sup> the nearest Agricultural Preserve parcels are located over one mile away from the Project corridor. Therefore, the Lane Diet project did not conflict with Williamson Act Contract lands.

### **Issue 3: Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g)).**

As illustrated on the City's E-Zoning, none of the parcels within the Project corridor are zoned forest lands or timberlands. Therefore, the Lane Diet project did not result conflict or cause rezoning of forest or timberlands.

### **Issue 4: Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.**

There are no forest lands within the Project corridor or in the vicinity. Therefore, the Lane Diet project did not result in the conversion of forest lands to non-forest uses.

### **Issue 5: Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use.**

Please refer to Issue 1.

### **Cumulative Agricultural and Forestry Resources Impacts**

The lane restriping did not result in significant impacts to agricultural and forest lands for the reasons described above. Therefore, in combination with the cumulative projects identified in Figure 2-2, the Lane Diet project did not result in cumulatively considerable agricultural and forestry resources impacts.

#### **6.1.1.3 Air Quality**

A project would generally be considered to have a significant effect if it would:

1. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan.

---

<sup>1</sup> City of Encinitas. E-Zoning. <http://www.encinitasca.gov/index.aspx?page=361>. Accessed June 12, 2015.

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/lca/Pages/Index.aspx>. Accessed June 12, 2015.

2. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.
3. 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 releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors).
4. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.
5. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.

## Analysis

### **Issue 1: Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan.**

Although the Project corridor is in the San Diego Air Basin (SDAB), the Lane Diet project did not result in any land use changes. Therefore, this issue is not applicable to the Lane Diet project.

### **Issue 2: Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.**

The Lane Diet project generated short-term criteria air pollutant emissions from operation of lane striping equipment. However, such operations are required to comply with the standard requirements in the San Diego Air Pollution Control District (SDAPCD) Rules 55, 50, and 51 which are intended to reduce potential air quality impacts associated with heavy-duty equipment emissions to less than significant levels.

Because the Lane Diet project eliminated a vehicle lane by turning it into a dedicated bike lane and converted a “through” vehicle lane into a shared vehicle/bicycle lane, there is a potential that these improvements may contribute to an incremental increase in long-term mobile-source emissions from slowing of vehicles due to reduced roadway capacity, leading to localized traffic congestion and associated spikes in criteria air pollutant emissions and “CO hot-spots.” However, the lane restriping has not resulted in any intersections or roadway segments in the Project corridor operating at or below LOS E, otherwise triggering the need for a “CO micro-scale hotspot” analysis. In addition, the lane restriping did not cause any meaningful changes in traffic volumes, vehicle mixes, or any other factors resulting in substantial increases in mobile-source emissions relative to ambient conditions. Further, long-term mobile-source emissions are expected to decrease somewhat because the lane restriping is intended to promote more bicycle use. Therefore, there is no substantive evidence that the Lane Diet project has violated any air quality standard or has contributed substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.

## 6.0 LANE DIET ANALYSIS

---

**Issue 3: 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 releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors).**

### Cumulative Short-Term Emissions

With respect to cumulative SDAB-wide conditions, the SDAPCD has developed strategies to reduce short-term construction-related criteria air pollutant emissions outlined in the *Measures to Reduce Particulate Matter in San Diego County* (SDAPCD 2005). As stated above, the Lane Diet project was completed in compliance with SDAPCD Rules 55, 50, and 51 and these same requirements are also imposed on cumulative projects throughout the SDAB. Therefore, based on SDAPCD guidance, the heavy-duty equipment emissions associated with the Lane Diet project, in combination with those from the cumulative projects in Figure 2-2 have not resulted in cumulatively considerable short-term air quality impacts.

### Cumulative Long-Term Emissions

This issue is not applicable to the Lane Diet project.

**Issue 4: Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.**

Sensitive receptors are defined as facilities or land uses that include members of the population that are particularly sensitive to the effects of air pollutants, such as children, the elderly, and people with illnesses. The CARB has identified the following groups of individuals as the most likely to be affected by air pollution: the elderly over 65, children under 14, athletes, and persons with cardiovascular and chronic respiratory diseases such as asthma, emphysema, and bronchitis. Sensitive receptors along the east and west sides of the Project corridor include residences, schools, hospitals, and daycare centers. However, the lane restriping has not resulted in any intersections or roadway segments in the Project corridor operating at or below LOS E. Further, the lane restriping did not cause any meaningful changes in traffic volumes, vehicle mixes, or any other factors resulting in substantial increases in mobile-source emissions relative to ambient conditions. Therefore, the Lane Diet project did not expose any sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

**Issue 5: Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.**

Some objectionable odors may have emanated from the operation of diesel-powered lane-stripping, construction and paving equipment; however, no odor complaints were received. Therefore, the Lane Diet project did not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.

### **6.1.1.4 Biological Resources**

A project would generally be considered to have a significant effect if it would:

1. 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 the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

2. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service.
3. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected 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.
4. 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.
5. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.
6. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.

### Analysis

**Issue 1: 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 the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS).**

There are no natural habitats within the Project corridor or surrounding lands that could otherwise be occupied by special-status plant and wildlife species. Therefore, the Lane Diet project did not have a substantial adverse effect on such biological resources.

**Issue 2: Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the CDFW and USFWS.**

As stated above, there are no riparian habitats or sensitive vegetation communities within the Project corridor or surrounding lands. Therefore, the Lane Diet project did not have a substantial adverse effect on such biological resources.

**Issue 3: Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected 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.**

There are no jurisdictional wetlands within the Project corridor or surrounding lands. Therefore, the Lane Diet project did not have a substantial adverse effect on such biological resources.

## 6.0 LANE DIET ANALYSIS

---

### **Issue 4: 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.**

The North County Transit District (NCTD) railway ROW runs parallel to the Project corridor on the east side which limits movement of any native resident or migratory wildlife species and precludes native resident or migratory wildlife corridors. In addition, no wildlife corridors are designated by the General Plan within the corridor and immediate vicinity. Therefore, the Lane Diet project did not interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.

### **Issue 5: Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.**

The north portion of the Project corridor includes numerous mature trees including a median that provides a landscaped buffer, primarily eucalyptus trees, between Cadmus Street and La Costa Avenue. Aside from the trees, the median and east side of the corridor is sparsely landscaped with informal plantings of groundcovers and shrubs but primarily consists of dirt and wood bark mulch. On the west side of the Leucadia Boulevard intersection, at approximately the midpoint of the Project corridor, Leucadia Roadside Park consists of a lawn and trees, and provides a small open space area.

The City's Municipal Tree Ordinance (2011-04) promotes and protects public health, safety, and general welfare by providing for regulation of the planting, maintenance, and removal of trees within the public right-of-way or on public property. This Ordinance is meant to enhance the Urban Forestry Management Program adopted by City Council in March 2009. Section 5 (Planting) and Section 7 (Tree Maintenance Guidelines) of this Program require all trees designated for removal within public rights-of-way to be completely removed from the site and disposed of in an authorized manner. Trees not designated for removal are protected under Section 2 (Protection of Trees During Construction). Excavation of ditches, tunnels, trenches, or drives are not allowed within the Tree Protection Zone as spelled out in Section 2.30.3.

The Lane Diet project consisted of lane restriping which did not impact any existing trees or vegetation; therefore, it did not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.

### **Issue 6: Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP), Natural Community Conservation Plan (NCCP), or other approved local, regional, or State HCP.**

The Project corridor is not within the boundaries of the draft North County Multiple Species Conservation Plan or adopted North County Multiple Habitat Conservation Program. Therefore, the Lane Diet project did not conflict with the provisions of an adopted local HCP or NCCP.

### **Cumulative Biological Resources Impacts**

The lane restriping did not result in significant impacts to biological resources or wildlife corridors, nor did it conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting such resources or with the provisions of an adopted

local HCP or NCCP, as described above. Therefore, in combination with the cumulative projects identified in Figure 2-2, the Lane Diet project did not result in cumulatively considerable biological resources impacts.

### **6.1.1.5 Cultural and Paleontological Resources**

A project would generally be considered to have a significant effect if it would:

1. Cause a substantial Adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines 15064.5.
2. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5.
3. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.
4. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

#### Analysis

##### **Issue 1: Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines 15064.5.**

The Lane Diet project did not involve demolition or alteration of any existing structures within the Project corridor and, therefore, did not result in a substantial adverse change to a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5.

##### **Issue 2: Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5.**

The Lane Diet project did not involve ground disturbance and, therefore, did not result in a substantial adverse change to an archaeological resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5.

##### **Issue 3: Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.**

The Lane Diet project did not involve ground disturbance and, therefore, did not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or geologic feature.

##### **Issue 4: Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.**

The Lane Diet project did not involve ground disturbance and, therefore, did not disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

#### **Cumulative Cultural and Paleontological Resources Impacts**

The lane restriping did not result in significant impacts to cultural or paleontological resources, as described above. Therefore, in combination with the cumulative projects identified in Figure 2-2, the Lane Diet project did not result in cumulatively considerable cultural resources impacts.

### 6.1.1.6 *Geology and Soils*

A project would generally be considered to have a significant effect if it would:

1. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:
  - 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.
  - b. Strong seismic ground shaking.
  - c. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction.
  - d. Landslides.
2. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.
3. Be located on a geologic unit 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.
4. 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.
5. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater.

### Analysis

**Issue 1a: Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving 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.**

This issue is not applicable to the Lane Diet project.

**Issue 1b: Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving strong seismic ground shaking.**

This issue is not applicable to the Lane Diet project.

**Issue 1c: Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction.**

This issue is not applicable to the Lane Diet project.

**Issue 1d: Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving landslides.**

This issue is not applicable to the Lane Diet project.

**Issue 2: Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.**

This issue is not applicable to the Lane Diet project.

**Issue 3: Be located on a geologic unit 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.**

This issue is not applicable to the Lane Diet project.

**Issue 4: 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.**

This issue is not applicable to the Lane Diet project.

**Issue 5: Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater.**

This issue is not applicable to the Lane Diet project.

**Cumulative Geology and Soils Impacts**

The lane restriping did/would not result in significant impacts to geological formations or soils, as described above. Therefore, in combination with the cumulative projects identified in Figure 2-2, the Lane Diet project did/would not result in cumulatively considerable geology/soils impacts.

**6.1.1.7 Greenhouse Gas Emissions**

A project would generally be considered to have a significant effect if it would:

1. Generate cumulatively considerable greenhouse gas emissions that exceed 900 metric tons per year (equivalent to 50 dwelling units).
2. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.

Analysis

**Issue 1: Generate cumulatively considerable greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions that exceed 900 metric tons per year (equivalent to 50 dwelling units).**

This issue is not applicable to the Lane Diet project.

## 6.0 LANE DIET ANALYSIS

---

### **Issue 2: Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.**

By eliminating a vehicle lane by turning it into a dedicated bike lane and converting a “through” vehicle lane into a shared vehicle/bicycle lane, the Lane Diet project is intended to decrease mobile-source GHG emissions. By promoting increased bicycle use (alternative means of transportation), the Lane Diet project would be consistent with the City’s Climate Action Plan, the State’s AB32 Scoping Plan, and the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association measures, and would therefore not conflict with applicable plans, policies and regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions.

#### **6.1.1.8 Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

A project would generally be considered to have a significant effect if it would:

1. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.
2. 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.
3. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.
4. 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 it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.
5. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.
6. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.
7. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.
8. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands.

### Analysis

#### **Issue 1: Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.**

Lane restriping involves the use of paint which is considered a hazardous material; however, this activity is required to comply with standard safety procedures to avoid the potential for significant hazards to the

public and environment or accidents that could result in the release of hazardous substances into the environment. Therefore, the Lane Diet project did not create such conditions.

**Issue 2: 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.**

Please refer to Issue 1 above.

**Issue 3: Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.**

Please refer to Issue 1 above.

**Issue 4: 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 it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.**

This issue is not applicable to the Lane Diet project.

**Issue 5: For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.**

This issue is not applicable to the Lane Diet project.

**Issue 6: For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.**

This issue is not applicable to the Lane Diet project.

**Issue 7: Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.**

The Lane Diet project did not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan along the Project corridor because one travel lane in each direction was fully functional while lane restriping was performed.

**Issue 8: Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands.**

The Project corridor is within a developed area, largely surrounded by urbanized land uses, and is not adjacent to any wildlands. Therefore, the Lane Diet project did not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires.

### **Cumulative Hazards and Hazardous Materials Impacts**

As described above, the lane restriping did not create significant hazards to the public and environment or accidents that could result in the release of hazardous substances into the environment; impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan; or expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires. Therefore, in combination with the cumulative projects identified in Figure 2-2, the Lane Diet project did/would not result in cumulatively considerable hazards or hazardous materials impacts.

#### **6.1.1.9 Hydrology and Water Quality**

A project would result in a significant impact if it would:

1. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements;
2. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of 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);
3. 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 substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;
4. 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;
5. 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;
6. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality;
7. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map;
8. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows;
9. 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,
10. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

### Analysis

#### **Issue 1: Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.**

This issue is not applicable to the Lane Diet project.

**Issue 2: Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of 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).**

This issue is not applicable to the Lane Diet project.

**Issue 3: 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 substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site.**

This issue is not applicable to the Lane Diet project.

**Issue 4: 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.**

This issue is not applicable to the Lane Diet project.

**Issue 5: 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.**

Lane striping occurred within the existing paved right-of-way which did not result in an increase in urban runoff flows beyond existing conditions. In addition, the use of fast-drying paint to restripe the roadway minimized the risk of polluted runoff washing into the storm drain system that could otherwise substantially degrade water quality. Therefore, the Lane Diet project did not provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff.

**Issue 6: Otherwise substantially degrade water quality.**

Please refer to Issue 5 above.

**Issue 7: Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map.**

This issue is not applicable to the Lane Diet project.

**Issue 8: Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows.**

This issue is not applicable to the Lane Diet project.

## 6.0 LANE DIET ANALYSIS

---

### **Issue 9: 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.**

This issue is not applicable to the Lane Diet project.

### **Issue 10: Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.**

This issue is not applicable to the Lane Diet project.

### **Cumulative Hydrology and Water Quality Impacts**

As described above, the lane restriping did not result in substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil; or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff that could otherwise substantially degrade water quality. Therefore, in combination with the cumulative projects identified in Figure 2-2, the Lane Diet project did not result in cumulatively considerable hydrology and water quality impacts.

#### **6.1.1.10 Land Use and Planning**

A project would result in a significant impact if it would:

1. Physically divide an established community.
2. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.
3. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.

### Analysis

#### **Issue 1: Physically divide an established community.**

This issue is not applicable to the Lane Diet project.

#### **Issue 2: Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.**

This issue is not applicable to the Lane Diet project.

#### **Issue 3: Conflict with any applicable HCP or NCCP.**

This issue is not applicable to the Lane Diet project.

## **Cumulative Land Use Impacts**

As described above, the lane restriping did not physically divide an established community; conflict with an applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect; or conflict with an applicable HCP or NCCP. Therefore, in combination with the cumulative projects identified in Figure 2-2, the Lane Diet project did not result in cumulatively considerable land use impacts.

### **6.1.1.11 Minerals**

A project would generally be considered to have a significant effect if it would:

1. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state.
2. Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan.

## Analysis

### **Issue 1: Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the State.**

This issue is not applicable to the Lane Diet project.

### **Issue 2: Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan.**

This issue is not applicable to the Lane Diet project.

## **Cumulative Mineral Resources Impacts**

As described above, the lane restriping did not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource of value to the region and the residents of the State, or a locally-important mineral resource recovery site. Therefore, in combination with the cumulative projects identified in Figure 2-2, the Lane Diet project did not result in cumulatively considerable mineral resources impacts.

### **6.1.1.12 Noise**

A project would generally be considered to have a significant effect if it would cause:

1. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies.
2. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.
3. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project.

## 6.0 LANE DIET ANALYSIS

---

4. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project.
5. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels.
6. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels.

### Analysis

**Issue 1: Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies.**

No noise complaints were received by the City as a result of the lane restriping. Therefore, the Lane Diet project did not expose persons to, nor generate noise levels in excess of, the City's Noise Ordinance limits.

**Issue 2: Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.**

This issue is not applicable to the Lane Diet project.

**Issue 3: A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project.**

This issue is not applicable to the Lane Diet project.

**Issue 4: A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project.**

Please refer to Issue 1 above.

**Issue 5: For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels.**

The Project corridor is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport.

**Issue 6: For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels.**

The Project corridor is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

### **Cumulative Noise Impacts**

As described above, the lane restriping did not expose persons to, nor generate noise levels in excess of, the City's Noise Ordinance limits; or expose persons to excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels; or result in substantial permanent, temporary or periodic increases in ambient noise levels. Therefore, in combination with the cumulative projects identified in Figure 2-2, the Lane Diet project did not result in cumulatively considerable noise impacts.

#### **6.1.1.13 Population and Housing**

A project would generally be considered to have a significant effect if it would:

1. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure).
2. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

### Analysis

**Issue 1: Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure).**

This issue is not applicable to the Lane Diet project.

**Issue 2: Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.**

This issue is not applicable to the Lane Diet project.

### **Cumulative Population and Housing Impacts**

As described above, the lane restriping did not induce population growth nor displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. Therefore, in combination with the cumulative projects identified in Figure 2-2, the Lane Diet project did not result in cumulatively considerable population and housing impacts.

#### **6.1.1.14 Public Services**

A project would generally be considered to have a significant effect if it would result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

1. Fire Protection

## 6.0 LANE DIET ANALYSIS

---

2. Police Protection
3. Schools
4. Parks
5. Other public facilities

### Analysis

#### **Issue 1: Fire Protection**

The Lane Diet project did not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan along the Project corridor because one travel lane in each direction was always maintained open while lane restriping was performed. Therefore, the Lane Diet project did not have a significant effect on fire protection services and emergency response times.

#### **Issue 2: Police Protection**

The Lane Diet project did not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan along the Project corridor because one travel lane in each direction was always maintained open while lane restriping was performed. Therefore, the Lane Diet project did not have a significant effect on police protection services and emergency response times.

#### **Issue3: Schools**

This issue is not applicable to the Lane Diet project.

#### **Issue 4: Parks**

This issue is not applicable to the Lane Diet project.

#### **Issue 5: Other Public Facilities**

This issue is not applicable to the Lane Diet project.

#### **Cumulative Public Services Impacts**

As described above, the lane restriping did not have a significant effect on fire and police protection services and emergency response times. Therefore, in combination with the cumulative projects identified in Figure 2-2, the Lane Diet project did not result in cumulatively considerable public services impacts.

#### **6.1.1.15 Recreation**

A project would generally be considered to have a significant effect if it would:

1. Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated.

2. Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

### Analysis

**Issue 1: Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated.**

This issue is not applicable to the Lane Diet project.

**Issue 2: Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.**

This issue is not applicable to the Lane Diet project.

### **Cumulative Recreation Impacts**

As described above, the lane restriping did not increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration would occur or be accelerated; and did not require construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment. Therefore, in combination with the cumulative projects identified in Figure 2-2, the Lane Diet project did not result in cumulatively considerable recreation impacts.

#### **6.1.1.16 Traffic and Transportation**

A project would result in a significant impact if it would:

1. Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections).
2. Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways.
3. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks.
4. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment).
5. Result in inadequate emergency access.
6. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks).

### Analysis

**Issue 1: Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections).**

This issue is not applicable to the Lane Diet project.

**Issue 2: Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways.**

This issue is not applicable to the Lane Diet project.

**Issue 3: Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks.**

This issue is not applicable to the Lane Diet project.

**Issue 4: Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment).**

This issue is not applicable to the Lane Diet project.

**Issue 5: Result in inadequate emergency access.**

The Lane Diet project did not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan along the Project corridor because one travel lane in each direction was always maintained open while lane restriping was performed. Therefore, the Lane Diet project did not result in inadequate emergency access.

**Issue 6: Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks).**

By eliminating a vehicle lane by turning it into a dedicated bike lane and converting a “through” vehicle lane into a shared vehicle/bicycle lane, the Lane Diet project is intended to promote more bicycle use (alternative means of transportation). Therefore, the Lane Diet project did/would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation.

### **Cumulative Traffic Impacts**

As described above, the lane restriping did not result in inadequate emergency access, or conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation. Therefore, in combination with the cumulative projects identified in Figure 2-2, the Lane Diet project did not result in cumulatively considerable traffic impacts.

### **6.1.1.17 Utilities and Service Systems**

A project would generally be considered to have a significant effect if it would:

1. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board.
2. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.
3. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.
4. Have insufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, and need new or expanded entitlements.
5. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has inadequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments.
6. Be served by a landfill with insufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs.
7. Not comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste

#### Analysis

#### **Issue 1: Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board.**

This issue is not applicable to the Lane Diet project.

#### **Issue 2: Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.**

This issue is not applicable to the Lane Diet project.

#### **Issue 3: Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.**

This issue is not applicable to the Lane Diet project.

#### **Issue 4: Have insufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, and need new or expanded entitlements.**

This issue is not applicable to the Lane Diet project.

## 6.0 LANE DIET ANALYSIS

---

**Issue 5: Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has inadequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments.**

This issue is not applicable to the Lane Diet project.

**Issue 6: Be served by a landfill with insufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs.**

This issue is not applicable to the Lane Diet project.

**Issue 7: Not comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.**

This issue is not applicable to the Lane Diet project.

### **Cumulative Utilities and Service Systems Impacts**

This issue is not applicable to the Lane Diet project.