

S.0 Executive Summary

S.1 Project Synopsis

This summary provides a brief synopsis of: (1) the proposed Housing Element Update (HEU), (2) the results of the environmental analysis contained within this Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR), (3) the major areas of controversy and issues to be resolved by decision-makers, and (4) the alternatives to the project that were considered. This summary does not contain the extensive background and analysis found in the document. Therefore, the reader should review the entire document to fully understand the project and its environmental consequences.

S.1.1 Project Location and Setting

The City of Encinitas (City) and Sphere of Influence are composed of approximately 13,328 acres of land in the County of San Diego, roughly 20 miles north of downtown San Diego and 95 miles south of Los Angeles. The jurisdictions that surround the City include: on its north side, the City of Carlsbad; on its south side, the City of Solana Beach; and on the east side, the unincorporated area of Rancho Santa Fe. On the City's west side lies the Pacific Ocean. The project area is located within the Coastal Zone and encompasses five communities—Leucadia, New Encinitas, Olivenhain, Old Encinitas, and Cardiff. The City is characterized by cliffs, coastal beaches, flat-topped coastal areas, rolling hills, and steep mesa bluffs. Batiquitos Lagoon is located in the north and the San Elijo Lagoon to the south of the City. The project area is generally accessed by Coast Highway 101 and Interstate 5 (I-5), both of which run north–south in the western portion of the project area.

S.1.2 Project Objectives

In accordance with California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15124, the following primary objectives support the purpose of the project, assist the Lead Agency in developing a reasonable range of alternatives to be evaluated in this report, and ultimately aid decision-makers in preparing findings and overriding considerations, if necessary. The purpose of the project is to address the housing needs and objectives of the City and to meet the requirements of State law. The project has the following objectives:

S.1.2.1 Housing Element Update

1. **Housing Choice.** Accommodate a variety of housing types to meet the needs of all Encinitas residents, creating opportunities for attainably priced housing for all income groups.
2. **Adequate Supply.** Provide adequate sites with corresponding density to meet the City's Regional Housing Needs Assessment allocation, inclusive of prior planning cycle carryover housing units.

3. **Effective Implementation.** Deliver State-mandated and locally desired programs to implement the City's Housing Element.

S.1.2.2 Housing Mapping Strategies

1. **Maintain Community Character.** Integrate future development using a blend of two- and three-story buildings or building elements into the City's seven community character contexts through appropriately located sites and project design, and embrace the unique cultural identities expressed in each of the five communities.
2. **Emphasize Mixed Use.** Accommodate mixed use, walkable places in key activity centers of every Encinitas community, while allowing for some standalone housing.
3. **Achieve a Variety of Neighborhood Types.** Provide a mix of building types and varied site designs that incorporate existing community character contexts to achieve a variety of neighborhood types in which to develop new housing and mixed use.
4. **Consider Infrastructure Conditions.** Ensure adequate infrastructure to support new housing by locating future development in areas that have existing or potential capacity for infrastructure and public services to accommodate it.
5. **Address Mobility Needs.** Maintain or enhance community access and mobility networks.
6. **Strive for a Sustainable Encinitas.** Coordinate planning for land use, transportation and housing to reduce environmental impacts and preserve a natural, healthy environment.
7. **Strengthen the Local Economy.** Locate housing in the right places to grow the economy organically by supporting local businesses and making the City more fiscally sustainable.
8. **Equitably Distribute Multifamily Housing.** Distribute attached and multi-family housing to the City's five communities.

S.1.3 Project Description

The project is *At Home in Encinitas*, the City's General Plan Housing Element Update (HEU) for the housing cycle 2013–2021. The State of California mandates that all cities and counties prepare a Housing Element as part of the comprehensive General Plan. The 2013–2021 Housing Element represents the City's effort in fulfilling the requirements under the State Housing Element law. The San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) Board of Directors adopted the final Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) Plan for this Housing Element cycle on October 28, 2011. The RHNA identified a housing need of 1,283 low and very low income housing units in the City, which also includes a carryover of 253 prior housing cycle units. These are attached and multi-family housing units.

The project includes an update to the uncertified 1992 Housing Element, including revised goals and policies, along with new and continuing implementation programs to ensure consistency with current State housing law. The update also integrates updated socioeconomic data, as well as other population and household characteristics to support the development of the Housing Element.

To meet these future housing needs, the City has identified 33 potential sites to accommodate new housing within each community. Various combinations of these viable housing sites comprise three concept housing strategy maps, which were selected by City Council for analysis in the PEIR. Each strategy includes a description of land uses, type of development, and basic site design that could be attained. Each of the three strategy maps are studied in detail in the PEIR. A fourth strategy map is studied as a feasible alternative in Chapter 9.0. Once a preferred plan is adopted by the City Council (estimated in spring/summer of 2016), the HEU would be presented to the voters of the City in November 2016.

In conjunction with the HEU, the City will adopt an implementation program that includes a General Plan Land Use Plan amendments; rezoning of housing sites; Zoning Code amendments; Municipal Code amendments; new Design Guidelines; amendments to the North 101 Corridor Specific Plan, Downtown Encinitas Specific Plan, Encinitas Ranch Specific Plan, and Cardiff-by-the-Sea Specific Plan; a Local Coastal Program Amendment; and the adoption of other programs necessary to implement the Housing Element, as set forth in the implementation program. A Noise Element amendment is being processed concurrently to resolve internal inconsistencies in the existing element and reflect contemporary noise standards. Finally, an amendment to the Community Character and Voters' Rights Initiative portion of the Land Use Element and Zoning Code Chapter 30.00 would modify building height limitations and authority to grant land use change approvals in very specific circumstances. Collectively, these actions would serve as a blueprint to accommodate future housing and provide housing-related services within the City.

S.2 Summary of Significant Effects and Mitigation Measures that Reduce or Avoid the Significant Effects

Table S-1, located at the end of this section, summarizes the significant and less than significant effects identified during the environmental analysis completed for the project. Table S-1 also includes a mitigation framework to reduce the significant environmental effects, with a conclusion as to whether the impact has been mitigated to below a level of significance. The mitigation measures listed in Table S-1 are also discussed within each relevant topical area in Chapter 4.0.

S.3 Areas of Controversy

The Notice of Preparation (NOP) was distributed on April 10, 2015, for a 30-day public comment period. In addition, a public scoping meeting was held on Thursday, April 23, 2015 at

5:00 p.m. at City Hall. Public comments received in conjunction with community outreach for the HEU and on the NOP reflect controversy related to several environmental issues. The NOP, comment letters, and transcription of the scoping meeting comments are included in this EIR as Appendix A-2. Potentially significant impacts related to the following environmental issue areas are analyzed in detail in the PEIR:

- 4.1 Aesthetics
- 4.2 Air Quality
- 4.3 Biological Resources
- 4.4 Cultural Resources
- 4.5 Geology and Soils
- 4.6 Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- 4.7 Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- 4.8 Hydrology and Water Quality
- 4.9 Land Use and Planning
- 4.10 Noise
- 4.11 Population and Housing
- 4.12 Public Services and Facilities
- 4.13 Transportation and Traffic
- 4.14 Public Utilities

S.4 Issues to be Resolved by the Decision-Making Body

Issues to be resolved include how to reduce significant, unavoidable adverse environmental impacts associated with the HEU to the maximum extent feasible while achieving HEU objectives, by adoption of mitigation measures and/or alternatives to the HEU identified in the PEIR. With regard to the 33 housing sites, the PEIR provides a discussion and evaluation of the location and proposed intensity of development at each of the individual sites and collectively, as housing strategies. The decision-making body will be required to select a housing strategy that balances local values and community character with State housing law.

S.5 Project Alternatives

To fully evaluate the environmental effects of projects, CEQA mandates that alternatives to the project be analyzed. Section 15126.6 of the CEQA Guidelines requires the discussion of “a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project” and the evaluation of the comparative merits of the alternatives. The alternatives discussion is intended to “focus on alternatives to the project or its location which are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant effects of the project,” even if these alternatives would impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives.

Chapter 9.0 provides a discussion of the Alternatives Considered but Rejected, a detailed analysis of the No Project (Development Under the Adopted General Plan) Alternative (No

Project Alternative) and the Sustainable Mixed Use Places Alternative (SMUP Alternative), and identifies the SMUP as the environmentally superior alternative, as required under CEQA.

S.5.1 No Project Alternative (Development Under the Adopted General Plan)

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 designations and zoning for the housing sites. Presently adopted land use designations, zoning and potential buildout yield for each housing site is summarized in Table 9-3. Total buildout potential for all 33 housing sites under the adopted General Plan and zoning would include 837 residential units and 2,175,291 square feet of commercial development. Presently, the housing sites contain only ~~98404~~ existing residential units; therefore, buildout of the No Project Alternative has the potential to yield an additional 7396 additional units. Approximately 625,000 square feet of additional commercial development is anticipated on the housing sites under buildout of the adopted General Plan, although redevelopment also could occur. Mixed-use development is permitted under the some of the City's adopted land use designations and zoning. Future projects consistent with the adopted General Plan, and therefore under the No Project Alternative, would be discretionary because nearly all projects in the City are required to undergo design review. In addition to design review, subdivision maps, conditional use permits, and Master Design Review Permits (MDPs) may be required for the entitlement of future development. Only custom single-family detached housing outside of the Coastal Zone may be developed ministerially.

Development under the No Project Alternative would not be in compliance with State law with regards to providing an adequate number of sites with high density residential zoning. This alternative would not satisfy the project objectives stated in Chapter 3.0, Project Description, which are restated above.

S.5.2 Sustainable Mixed Use Places Housing Strategy Alternative

The SMUP Alternative would meet the City's RHNA obligation, while providing adequate buffer to ensure compliance with State law requiring no net loss of adequate sites. Similar to the project, this alternative includes adoption of the draft Housing Element. This housing strategy alternative incorporates those housing sites identified in Chapter 3.0 that: (1) have fewer combined unmitigated/unavoidable impacts than the other three housing strategies; and (2) presents the fewest constraints to future implementation of future housing at those locations (refer to Figure 9-3 and Tables 9-4 and 9-5).

The SMUP Alternative represents an alternative to the HEU housing strategies addressed as the project in Chapter 3.0. It is an alternative that refines, but would have fewer impacts than the project's MMUP strategy, which was developed in response to substantial public input. This environmental analysis and the determination of substantial compliance for the draft

Housing Plan by Housing and Community Development (HCD) (see Appendix A-1), occurred subsequent to the creation of the MMUP strategy. With the benefit of the analysis and findings in this PEIR, along with the review of HCD, the SMUP Alternative was created. All sites that comprise the SMUP would meet the project's objectives. The differences and explanation for the changes from the MMUP housing strategies are as follows:

S.5.2.1 Sites Removed from the MMUP Housing Strategy in Development of the SMUP

C-2: The removal of housing site C-2 from the analysis reduced traffic trips.

CBHMG-1: The removal of housing site CBHMG-1 from the analysis reduced traffic trips. This site was also removed because the site is needed to remain in its existing condition for public utility purposes.

L-7: The removal of housing site L-7 from the analysis reduced multiple significant unmitigated aesthetic impacts. Currently, housing site L-7 is zoned as Rural Residential-1 (RR-1), which allows one unit per acre. The surrounding land uses are also predominately zoned RR-1.

O-2: This site was removed the SMUP strategy because the lower population of Olivenhain would adequately be served by a single, new mixed activity center, which is accomplished with housing sites ALT-4 and O-3 on the opposite side of Rancho Santa Fe Road. Additionally, removing O-2 would allow Rancho Santa Fe Road to serve as a visual break between more urban development on the west side of the road to a rural character on the east side. The removal of housing site O-2 also reduced impacts to cultural resources.

O-4: The removal of housing site O-4 from the analysis reduced multiple significant unmitigated aesthetic impacts.

ALT-5: The removal of housing site Alt-5 from the analysis reduced traffic trips.

ALT-6: Housing site Alt-6 was removed from the analysis because is the site is physically constrained and is needed to service transportation-related purposes at the Encinitas Transit Center.

S.5.2.2 Sites Included in the SMUP

a. Leucadia

ALT-2: Housing site Alt-2 was included in the SMUP Alternative because this site provides an opportunity to strengthen the walkable Main Street Corridor character of Leucadia. Additionally, its inclusion helps meet project objectives by transitioning residential yields from moderate-income categories to lower income categories.

b. Old Encinitas

OE-1: Housing site OE-1 was included in the SMUP Alternative because it provides an opportunity to convert incompatible heavy commercial and light industrial land uses adjacent to Moonlight Beach and the downtown walkable Main Street corridor with complementary and visitor-serving uses. Visitor-serving uses are an important consideration adjacent to the beach in the Coastal Zone.

OE-4: Housing site OE-4 was included in the SMUP Alternative because it provides an opportunity for redevelopment of the underutilized City Hall sites into a mixed use place immediately adjacent to the Encinitas transit center.

ALT-7: Housing site Alt-7 was included in the SMUP Alternative because it provides an opportunity to strengthen the walkable Main Street corridor character of Downtown Encinitas by converting underutilized sites to stitch together the whole of the downtown. Additionally, its inclusion helps meet project objectives by transitioning residential yields from moderate-income categories to lower income categories.

OE-7: Housing site OE-7 was included in the SMUP Alternative because while there is potential for biological resources, the site is ~~isolated~~ considered “infill” being fully surrounded by urbanization. Changing the land use from commercial to residential would reduce overall traffic trips and takes advantage of adjacent bus service.

c. Cardiff

C-1: Housing site C-1 was included in the SMUP Alternative because it provides an opportunity to complement the Encinitas Community Park by improving entrance aesthetics and allowing residents to walk to the park rather than drive from a distant site.

C-3: The addition of housing site C-3 is included in the SMUP alternative as a result of reduced traffic trips. C-3 also meets project objectives, particularly by accommodating mixed use to strengthen walkability of the area.

C-6: Housing site C-6 was included in the SMUP Alternative because it provides an opportunity to meet diverse housing needs.

d. New Encinitas

ALT-3: Housing site Alt-3 was included in the SMUP Alternative because it provides an opportunity to improve the aesthetics in the heart of the City’s commercial corridor.

NE-1: Housing site NE-1 was included in the SMUP Alternative because it reduces traffic trips and provides a mixed-use walkable place adjacent to existing shopping, park facility and planned cultural facility.

NE-7: Housing site NE-7 was included in the SMUP Alternative because it reduces traffic trips and provides a mixed-use walkable place for New Encinitas. It also provides an opportunity to improve the aesthetics in the heart of the City’s commercial corridor.

e. Olivenhain

ALT-4: Housing site Alt-4 was included in the SMUP Alternative because it focuses the change in land use to only one of the “four corners” of Olivenhain and supports the viability of the adjacent new mixed use site, O-3.

O-3: Included because it strongly meets the project objectives; reduces traffic trips compared to the No Project Alternative in providing a mixed use walkable place for Olivenhain.

S.6 Environmentally Superior Alternative

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(2) requires an EIR to identify the environmentally superior alternative. If the No Project Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative, the EIR must identify an environmentally superior alternative from the other alternatives. The project itself may not be identified as the environmentally superior alternative.

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 significant and unavoidable for the HEU, the SMUP Alternative would reduce these impacts through the selection of housing sites described above in the SMUP Alternative to reduce trips generation while improving aesthetics and alternative transit opportunities. Thus, the SMUP Alternative would meet all the project’s objectives and would result in compliance with State Housing Element law while meeting the City’s share of allocated RHNA units. In conclusion, the SMUP Alternative is considered the environmentally superior alternative, because it would result in fewer impacts than any of the project’s three HEU housing strategies and still meets the project’s objectives.

**Table S-1
Summary of Significant Environmental Analysis Results – HEU Housing Strategies 1-3 and the SMUP Alternative**

Environmental Issue	Results of Impact Analysis	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
Aesthetics			
<p>Issue 1: Plan Consistency</p> <p>Would the project conflict with any City policy or regulation relative to the protection of visual resources (i.e., General Plan/LCP policies, Hillside/Inland Bluff Overlay Zone, Scenic Visual Corridor Overlay Zone/Design Review Guidelines) thereby resulting in a negative aesthetic/visual impact?</p>	<p><u>Housing strategies 1 – Ready Made (RM), 2 – Build Your Own (BYO), 3 – Modified Mixed Use Places (MMUP), and the SMUP Alternative would not conflict with any City policy or regulation protecting visual resources, including General Plan/LCP policies, Hillside/Inland Bluff Overlay Zone, or Scenic Visual Corridor Overlay Zone/Design Review Guidelines. There would be no inherent differences in impacts among the housing strategies or the SMUP Alternative. Therefore, impacts to plan consistency under the any of the three housing strategies or SMUP Alternative would be less than significant</u></p> <p>The HEU would not conflict with any City policy or regulation relative to the protection of visual resources; thus, impacts would be less than significant.</p>	<p>Impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.</p>	<p><u>Housing Strategies 1 (RM), 2 (BYO), and 3 (MMUP) - Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>SMUP Alternative – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Less than significant</u></p>
<p>Issue 2: Public Views</p> <p>Would the project result in development that:</p> <p>a. is incompatible in shape, form, or intensity, such that public views from designated open space areas, view corridors or scenic highways, or to any significant visual landmarks or scenic vistas would be substantially blocked?</p> <p>b. is located in a highly visible area (e.g., on a canyon edge, hilltop or adjacent to an interstate highway) and would strongly contrast with the surrounding development or natural topography through excessive height, bulk, signage, or architectural projections?</p>	<p>One housing site, site O-4, would result in a potentially significant impact (Impact VIS-1) on scenic views of the San Elijo Lagoon from the scenic roadways South El Camino Real and Manchester Avenue particularly for southbound travelers along South El Camino Real to southbound Manchester where expansive views toward San Elijo Lagoon would be substantially blocked by development of a Neighborhood Center/Mixed Use-Large Site housing site neighborhood prototype. Development of all other housing sites would result in a less than significant impact to public views.</p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 1 – Ready Made (RM)</u></p> <p><u>Development within housing strategy 1 (RM) would result in less than significant impacts to public views.</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 2 – Build Your Own (BYO)</u></p> <p><u>Development within housing strategy 2 (BYO) has potential to impact scenic views of the San Elijo Lagoon as viewed from the scenic roadways, South El Camino Real and Manchester Avenue, resulting from development of housing site O-4.</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 3 – Modified Mixed Use Places (MMUP)</u></p> <p><u>Development within housing strategy 3 (MMUP) has potential to impact scenic views of the San Elijo Lagoon as viewed from the scenic roadways, South El Camino Real and Manchester Avenue, resulting from development of housing site O-4.</u></p> <p><u>SMUP Alternative - Impacts related to public views from future development under the SMUP Alternative would be less than under the HEU housing strategies. Housing site O-4 would not be included in the SMUP Alternative. Therefore, construction on this site would be limited to nine residential units as allowed under the adopted plan. Therefore, impacts to public views would be less than significant.</u></p>	<p>As the floating new zone standards and design guidelines are intended to maximize consistency with the surrounding land use context, including preserving significant views, the project already incorporates standards to maximize protection of views to the extent feasible. Thus, no further mitigation has been identified at the plan level to minimize the adverse impact to views resulting from development of site O-4.</p>	<p><u>Housing Strategy 1 (RM) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 2 (BYO) – Significant and Unavoidable</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 3- (MMUP) – Significant and Unavoidable</u></p> <p><u>SMUP Alternative– Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Remaining Sites – Less than Significant</u></p>

**Table S-1
Summary of Significant Environmental Analysis Results – HEU Housing Strategies 1-3 and the SMUP Alternative**

Environmental Issue	Results of Impact Analysis	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
<p>Issue 3: Community Character</p> <p>Would the project introduce features which would conflict with important visual elements or the quality of the community/neighborhood (such as theme, style, setbacks, density, size, massing, coverage, scale, color, architecture, building materials, light/glare, etc.) and would thereby negatively and substantially alter the existing character of neighborhoods?</p>	<p>Implementation of the HEU on housing sites L-7, O-4, and O-5 would result in potentially significant impacts to community character (Impacts VIS-2, VIS-3, and VIS-4 respectively) because even with application of the zoning standards and design guidelines, development of these sites at the intensity required to meet housing elements goals would result in a scale of development inconsistent with the surrounding low-scale, rural environment. Development of all other housing sites would result in less than significant impacts associated with community character.</p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 1 – Ready Made</u></p> <p><u>Development within housing strategy 1 (RM) would result in a potentially significant impact to community character due to future development on housing site O-5.</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 2 – Build Your Own</u></p> <p><u>Development within housing strategy 2 (BYO) would result in a potentially significant impact to community character due to future development on housing site O-4, O-5, and L-7.</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 3 – Modified Mixed Use Places</u></p> <p><u>Development within housing strategy 3 (MMUP) would result in a potentially significant impact to community character due to future development on housing site O-4 and L-7.</u></p> <p><u>SMUP Alternative - Impacts related to community character from future development under the SMUP Alternative would be less than development under the HEU housing strategies. These housing sites L-7, O-4 and O-5 would not be included in the SMUP Alternative. Therefore, impacts to community character would be less than significant.</u></p>	<p>As the floating zone standards and design guidelines are intended to maximize consistency with the surrounding land use context and character of individual neighborhoods, the project already incorporates features to maximize protection of community character to the extent feasible. Thus, no further mitigation is available at the program-level to reduce the adverse impact resulting from development of sites L-7 (Impact VIS-2), O-4 (Impact VIS-3), and O-5 (Impact VIS-4).</p>	<p><u>Housing Strategy 1 (RM) – Significant and Unavoidable</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 2 (BYO) – Significant and Unavoidable</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 3- (MMUP) – Significant and Unavoidable</u></p> <p><u>SMUP Alternative – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Sites L-7, O-4, O-5 – Significant and Unavoidable</u></p> <p><u>Remaining Sites – Less than Significant</u></p>

**Table S-1
Summary of Significant Environmental Analysis Results – HEU Housing Strategies 1-3 and the SMUP Alternative**

Environmental Issue	Results of Impact Analysis	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
<p>Issue 4: Scenic Resources</p> <p>Would the project result in the physical loss, isolation, degradation or destruction of a visual resource or community identification symbol or landmark or other features that contribute to the valued visual character or image of the neighborhood, community, or localized area (e.g., a stand of mature trees, coastal bluff, native habitat, historic landmark)?</p>	<p><u>The eastern edge of housing site O-4 contains a large stand of mature vegetation that is a visual extension of the natural open space associated with Escondido Creek and the San Elijo Lagoon to the south. Development of this site at proposed housing densities would require development of the majority of the site, which would eliminate this scenic resource, resulting in a significant impact (Impact VIS-5).</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 1 – Ready Made</u></p> <p><u>Development within housing strategy 1 (RM) would result in less than significant impacts to scenic resources.</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 2 – Build Your Own</u></p> <p><u>Development within housing strategy 2 (BYO) has potential to impact scenic resources on housing site O-4:</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 3 – Modified Mixed Use Places</u></p> <p><u>Development within housing strategy 32 (MMUP) has potential to impact scenic resources on housing site O-4:</u></p> <p><u>SMUP Alternative - Housing site O-4 would not be included in the SMUP Alternative. Therefore, impacts to scenic resources under the SMUP Alternative would be less than significant. Development of housing site O-4 would result in a significant impact to scenic resources (Impact VIS 5) because it would impact views of the mature vegetation that is a visual extension of the natural open space associated with Escondido Creek and the San Elijo Lagoon to the south.</u></p>	<p>Implementation of the floating zone standards and design guidelines would preserve scenic resources to the greatest extent feasible. No additional mitigation at the program-level is available to avoid the adverse impact to scenic resources resulting from development of site O-4.</p>	<p><u>Housing Strategy 1 (RM) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 2 (BYO) – Significant and Unavoidable</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 3- (MMUP) – Significant and Unavoidable</u></p> <p><u>SMUP Alternative – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Site O-4 – Significant and Unavoidable</u></p> <p><u>Remaining Sites – Less than Significant</u></p>

**Table S-1
Summary of Significant Environmental Analysis Results – HEU Housing Strategies 1-3 and the SMUP Alternative**

Environmental Issue	Results of Impact Analysis	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
Air Quality			
<p>Issue 1: Consistency with RAQS</p> <p>Would the project conflict with the primary goals of the RAQS?</p>	<p><u>HEU Housing Strategies: Each of the housing strategies would result in greater emissions than buildout of the adopted plan. Additionally, housing strategies 1 (RM) and 2 (BYO) would result in emissions that are greater than the thresholds for CO and PM₁₀, and housing strategy 3 (MMUP) would result in emissions that are greater than the thresholds for ROG, CO, and PM₁₀. Housing strategy 3 (MMUP) would result in the greatest emissions, followed by housing strategy 2 (BYO) and then housing strategy 1 (RM).</u></p> <p><u>All three strategies encourage increased development diversity by increasing commercial and multi-family land uses. Locating different land uses types near one another can decrease vehicle miles travelled (VMT), since trips between land use types are shorter and may be accommodated by alternative modes of transportation (CAPCOA 2010). Each of the housing strategies would increase vehicle trip efficiency. Additionally, as discussed under Issue 2, total emissions due to operation of each of the modeled housing sites would be less than the applicable thresholds for all criteria pollutants. However, because the HEU would exceed the growth projections currently accounted for in the land use plan and would result in emissions that are greater than what is currently accounted for in the RAQS, impacts would be significant. Additionally, the significant air quality impacts could contribute to a pollutant for which the area is non-attainment. Therefore, this is considered to be a significant and unavoidable impact (Impact AQ-1).</u></p> <p><u>SMUP Alternative - Impacts related to plan consistency from future development under the SMUP Alternative would be same as the HEU housing strategies. Existing regional air plans are based on the existing City forecasts; future development under both the HEU and the SMUP Alternative would increase growth in the City not currently accounted for resulting in a significant and unavoidable impact at the program-level.</u></p> <p><u>The CARB mobile source emission projections and SANDAG growth projections are based on population and vehicle trends and land use plans developed by cities. As such, projects that propose development that is consistent with the growth anticipated by the general plan (or less dense) would be consistent with the RAQS. If a project proposes development that is greater than that is assumed in SANDAG's growth projections upon which the RAQS is based, then the project would be in conflict with the RAQS and SIP. However, the current population and housing in the County are lower than what was projected for the region, and therefore it is unlikely that the additional units from the HEU would interfere with the SDAPCD's goals for improving air quality in the SDAB.</u></p> <p><u>However, from a long term planning standpoint, implementation of any of the housing strategies would not comply with the existing assumptions of density and land use utilized to develop the RAQS and applicable SIP. Therefore, a revised housing forecast will need to be provided to SANDAG to ensure that the next revisions to the RAQS and the SIP accurately reflect the anticipated growth. SANDAG housing forecasts are updated every four years. The next forecast is scheduled for revision in 2019.</u></p> <p><u>Because the HEU would result in emissions that are greater than what is currently accounted for in the RAQS. The significant air quality impacts would contribute to a pollutant for which the area is non-attainment. Therefore, this is considered to be a significant impact (Impact AQ-1).</u></p>	<p>The following mitigation measure will address the project's inconsistency.</p> <p>AQ-1: Prior to the next update of the regional housing needs assessment and within six months of the certification of the final EIR, the City shall provide a revised housing forecast to SANDAG to ensure that any revisions to the population and employment projections used by SDAPCD in updating the RAQS and the SIP will accurately reflect anticipated growth due to the HEU.</p>	<p><u>Housing Strategy 1 (RM) – Significant and Unavoidable</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 2 (BYO) – Significant and Unavoidable</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 3- (MMUP) – Significant and Unavoidable</u></p> <p><u>SMUP Alternative – Significant and Unavoidable</u></p> <p><u>Significant and Unavoidable</u></p>

**Table S-1
Summary of Significant Environmental Analysis Results – HEU Housing Strategies 1-3 and the SMUP Alternative**

Environmental Issue	Results of Impact Analysis	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
<p>Issue 2: Criteria Pollutants</p> <p>Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable Federal or State ambient air quality standard (including release emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?</p>	<p>HEU Housing Strategies:</p> <p><u>Under housing strategy 1 (RM), construction of housing site NE-4 would result in emissions of ROG that exceed the significance threshold of 250 pounds per day, and construction emissions would be potentially significant. Housing sites OE-5 and C-2 would also result in potentially significant construction emissions (Impact AQ-2).</u></p> <p><u>Under housing strategy 2 (BYO), construction of housing site OE-8 would result in emissions of ROG that exceed the significance threshold of 250 pounds per day, and construction emissions would be potentially significant. Housing sites C-2 and NE-3 would also result in potentially significant construction emissions (Impact AQ-2).</u></p> <p><u>Under housing strategy 3 (MMUP), construction of housing site ALT-7 would result in emissions of ROG that exceed the significance threshold of 250 pounds per day, and construction emissions would be potentially significant. Housing sites ALT-2, ALT-3, ALT-5, C-2, C-1 and NE-1 would also result in potentially significant construction emissions (Impact AQ-2).</u></p> <p><u>SMUP Alternative - The SMUP Alternative would only include the following sites potentially impacted by construction ROG emissions: ALT-7, ALT-2, ALT-3, C-1, and NE-1.</u></p> <p><u>For all other housing sites under the housing strategies and the SMUP Alternative, construction emissions would be less than significant.</u></p> <p><u>The operational emissions associated with all housing sites would be less than significant.</u></p> <p>Operational emissions associated with all housing sites would be less than significant. Construction of the following 11 housing sites would result in emissions of ROG that exceed the significance threshold of 250 pounds per day: ALT-7, ALT-2, NE-4, ALT-3, OE-5, ALT-5, OE-8, C-2, NE-3, C-1 and NE-1 (Impact AQ-2). For all other housing sites, construction emissions would be less than significant.</p>	<p>AQ-2: For future development of housing sites consistent with the HEU Floating Zone pProgram, wherein the City has determined a potential for ROG emissions impacts could occur, the Planning and Building Department shall require that the construction contractor be limited to the use of architectural coating (paint and primer) products that have a low- to no-VOC rating.</p>	<p><u>Housing Strategy 1 (RM) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 2 (BYO) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 3- (MMUP) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>SMUP Alternative – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Less than Significant</u></p>

**Table S-1
Summary of Significant Environmental Analysis Results – HEU Housing Strategies 1-3 and the SMUP Alternative**

Environmental Issue	Results of Impact Analysis	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
<p>Issue 3: Sensitive Receptors</p> <p>Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</p>	<p>HEU Housing Strategies:</p> <p><u><i>Diesel Particulate Matter</i></u></p> <p><u>For all three housing strategies, a majority of the housing sites are located more than 500 feet from I-5, and impacts associated with exposure to diesel particulate matter would be less than significant. However, the following housing sites associated with housing strategies 1-3 are located within 500 feet from I-5: housing strategy 1 (RM): L-4 and L-5; housing strategy 2 (BYO): OE-2; and housing strategy 3 (MMUP): C-1 and CBHMG-1. Impacts on these sites associated with diesel particulate matter exposure would be potentially significant, and therefore require mitigation (Impact AQ-3).</u></p> <p><u><i>Carbon Monoxide Hot Spots</i></u></p> <p><u>For all three housing strategies, the maximum CO concentrations are not anticipated to exceed Federal and State standards. Thus, impacts associated with CO hot spots would be less than significant.</u></p> <p><u>SMUP Alternative – Impacts associated with CO hot spots from future development under the SMUP Alternative would be less than significant. Regarding the five housing sites associated with diesel particulate matter exposure, only housing site C-1 is included in the SMUP Alternative. Impacts on site C-1 associated with diesel particulate matter would be potentially significant, and therefore require mitigation (Impact AQ-3).</u></p>	<p>AQ-3: In order to reduce impacts associated with exposure to diesel particulate matter, the following mitigation is recommended.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Future development under with the HEU floating<u>new</u> zone program shall be designed to minimize exposure to roadway-related pollutants and exposure shall be mitigated to the maximum extent feasible. Design features may include but are not be limited to: maximizing the distance between the roadway and sensitive receptors; locating air intake at the non-roadway facing sides of buildings, and ensuring that windows nearest to the roadway do not open. The orientation and placement of outdoor facilities designed for moderate physical activity shall be placed as far from the emission source as possible. Mitigation may also include installing mechanical ventilation systems with fresh air filtration and constructing a physical barrier between the roadway source and receptors of pollutants (e.g., sound wall or vegetative planting). • New parks with athletic fields, courts, and other outdoor facilities designed for moderate to vigorous activity under the HEU floating<u>new</u> -zone program should be sited at least 500 feet from the freeway. Exceptions to this recommended practice should be made only upon a written finding from a decision-making body that the benefits of such development outweigh the public health risks or that a site-specific analysis demonstrates a less than significant risk. . • Ventilation Systems: Ventilation systems that are rated at Minimum Efficiency Reporting Value of “MERV13” or better for enhanced particulate removal efficiency shall be provided on all residential units within the HEU floating<u>new</u> zone, located within 500 feet of I-5. • City staff shall ensure that the aforementioned requirements are included on plans associated with any permit for future development consistent with the HEU floating<u>new</u> -zone program and submitted for approval. The City shall verify compliance on-site prior to occupancy clearance. Staff shall also review the future Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions for inclusion of guidelines pertaining to the proper maintenance/replacement of filters. 	<p><u>Housing Strategy 1 (RM) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 2 (BYO) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 3- (MMUP) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>SMUP Alternative – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Less than significant.</u></p>

**Table S-1
Summary of Significant Environmental Analysis Results – HEU Housing Strategies 1-3 and the SMUP Alternative**

Environmental Issue	Results of Impact Analysis	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
Biological Resources			
<p>Issue 1: Sensitive Species</p> <p>Would the project have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by CDFW or USFWS?</p>	<p>Direct impacts to sensitive plants and sensitive wildlife (Impact BIO-1) within housing sites ALT 4, ALT 5, C 6, L 4, L 7, NE 3, O 2, O 4, O 5, O 6, OE 1, OE 2, and OE 7 would be potentially significant. Direct and/or indirect impacts to least Bell’s vireo (Impact BIO-2), and within housing sites ALT 7, NE 1, O 4, O 5, and OE 2 would be potentially significant. Direct direct impacts to migratory or nesting birds (Impact BIO-3) within housing sites ALT 2, ALT 4, ALT 5, ALT 7, C 2, C 6, CBHMG 1, L 4, L 5, L 7, NE 1, NE 3, NE 4, NE 7, O 2, O 3, O 4, O 5, O 6, OE 1, OE 2, and OE 7 would be potentially significant within the following housing sites for each strategy: (Impact BIO-3).</p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 1 – Ready Made (RM)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Impact BIO-1 - Sensitive plants and wildlife on L-4, O-2, O-5, O-6, OE-1, OE-2, and OE-7;</u> • <u>Impact BIO2 - Least Bell’s vireo on O-5; and</u> • <u>Impact BIO-3 - Nesting or migratory birds on C-2, L-4, L-5, NE-4, O-2, O-5, O-6, OE-1, and OE-7.</u> <p><u>Housing Strategy 2 – Build Your Own (BYO)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Impact BIO-1 - Sensitive plants and wildlife on L-7, NE-3, O-2, O-4, O-5, OE-2, and OE-7;</u> • <u>Impact BIO-2 - Least Bell’s vireo on NE-1, O-4, O-5, and OE-2; and</u> • <u>Impact BIO-3 - Nesting or migratory birds on C-2, L-7, NE-1, NE-3, NE-7, O-2, O-4, O 5, OE-2, and OE-7.</u> <p><u>Housing Strategy 3 – Modified Mixed Use Places (MMUP)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Impact BIO-1 - Sensitive plants and wildlife on C-6, L-7, O-2, O-4, OE-1, and OE-7;</u> • <u>Impact BIO-2 - Least Bell’s vireo on NE-1 and O-4; and</u> • <u>Impact BIO-3 - Nesting or migratory birds on C-2, C-6, L-7, NE-1, NE-7, O-2, O-3, O-4, OE-1, and OE-7.</u> 	<p>BIO-1: Applications for future development of housing sites consistent with the new HEU floating-zone program, wherein the City has determined a potential for impacts to sensitive biological resources, shall be required to comply with the following mitigation framework:</p> <p>a) A site-specific general biological resources survey shall be conducted to identify the presence of any sensitive biological resources, including any sensitive plant or wildlife species. A biological resources report shall be submitted to the City to document the results of the biological resources survey. The report shall include (1) the methods used to determine the presence of sensitive biological resources; (2) vegetation mapping of all vegetation communities and/or land cover types; (3) the locations of any sensitive plant or wildlife species; (4) an evaluation of the potential for occurrence of any listed, rare, and narrow endemic species; and (5) an evaluation of the significance of any potential direct or indirect impacts from the proposed project. If potentially significant impacts to sensitive biological resources are identified, future project-level grading and site plans shall incorporate project design features to minimize direct impacts on sensitive biological resources to the extent feasible, and the report shall also recommend appropriate mitigation to reduce the impacts to below a level of significance.</p> <p>b) If suitable habitat for sensitive species is identified within the housing site based on the general biological survey, then focused presence/absence surveys shall be conducted in accordance with applicable resource agency survey protocols.</p>	<p><u>Housing Strategy 1 (RM) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 2 (BYO) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 3- (MMUP) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>SMUP Alternative – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Less than Significant</u></p>

**Table S-1
Summary of Significant Environmental Analysis Results – HEU Housing Strategies 1-3 and the SMUP Alternative**

Environmental Issue	Results of Impact Analysis	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
	<p>SMUP Alternative - Under the SMUP Alternative, Impacts BIO-1 through BIO-3 would be potentially significant and therefore, require mitigation on the following housing sites included in this strategy: OE-1, OE-7, NE-1, C-6, NE-7, and O-3.</p>	<p>BIO-2: Prior to issuance of a permit for grading or vegetation removal, future development of housing sites consistent with the HEU floating new zone program, wherein the City has determined to the potential for impacts to least Bell's vireo, shall require USFWS protocol surveys for least Bell's vireo should project construction occur within 300 feet of riparian habitat during the breeding season (April 10 to July 31). If least Bell's vireo are identified during the protocol surveys, then noise attenuation measures shall be required to ensure that noise levels from construction do not exceed a 60 A-weighted decibels [dB(A)] hourly average per hour at the edge of the riparian habitat or to the ambient noise level if it exceeds 60 dB(A) prior to construction. Construction noise monitoring shall be required to verify that noise levels at the edge of occupied habitat are maintained below 60 dB(A) hourly average unless an analysis completed by a qualified acoustician shows that noise generated by construction activities would not exceed 60 dB(A) hourly average at the edge of occupied habitat.</p> <p>BIO-3: Prior to issuance of a permit for grading or vegetation removal, future development of housing sites consistent with the HEU floating new zone program, wherein the City has determined the presence of mature trees and/or native vegetation suitable for nesting birds in the future, shall require a pre-construction survey to determine the presence of active bird nests if vegetation clearing is proposed during the typical bird breeding season (January 15–September 15). The nesting bird survey shall be performed by a qualified biologist within one week prior to the start of vegetation clearing or construction activities. No direct impacts shall occur to any nesting birds or their eggs, chicks, or nests. If an active nest is located, nest avoidance measures would be required in accordance with the MBTA and CDFW code.</p>	<p><u>Housing Strategy 1 (RM) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 2 (BYO) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 3- (MMUP) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>SMUP Alternative – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 1 (RM) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 2 (BYO) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 3- (MMUP) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>SMUP Alternative - Less than Significant</u></p>

**Table S-1
Summary of Significant Environmental Analysis Results – HEU Housing Strategies 1-3 and the SMUP Alternative**

Environmental Issue	Results of Impact Analysis	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
<p>Issue 2: Sensitive Vegetation Communities</p> <p>Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on any sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by CDFW or USFWS?</p>	<p>Direct impacts to sensitive vegetation communities (Impact BIO-4) within <u>the following housing sites for each housing strategy and the SMUP Alternative ALT-4, ALT-5, C-6, L-4, L-7, NE-3, O-2, O-4, O-5, O-6, OE-1, OE-2, and OE-7</u> would be potentially significant and, therefore, require mitigation.</p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 1 – Ready Made</u></p> <p><u>Development within housing strategy 1 (RM) has potential to impact:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Sensitive vegetation communities on L-4, O-2, O-5, O-6, OE-1, and OE-7.</u> <p><u>Housing Strategy 2 – Build Your Own</u></p> <p><u>Development within housing strategy 2 (BYO) has potential to impact:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Sensitive vegetation communities on L-7, NE-3, O-2, O-4, O-5, OE-2, and OE-7.</u> <p><u>Housing Strategy 3 – Modified Mixed Use Places</u></p> <p><u>Development within housing strategy 3 (MMUP) has potential to impact:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Sensitive vegetation communities on ALT-4, ALT-5, C-6, L-7, O-2, O-4, OE-1, and OE 7.</u> <p><u>SMUP Alternative</u></p> <p><u>Development within the SMUP Alternative has potential to impact:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Sensitive vegetation communities on OE-1, OE-7, ALT-4, and C-6.</u> 	<p>Mitigation measure BIO-1 would require site-specific biology surveys, at the time future projects are proposed, as determined by the City based on the conditions at the time of application. Potentially significant impacts to sensitive vegetation communities shall be identified during the biology survey and project-specific mitigation measures to reduce the impacts to below a level of significance shall be identified in a biological resources report. Future development consistent with the HEU that would impact sensitive vegetation communities shall be required to comply with the following mitigation framework.</p> <p>BIO-4: Prior to issuance of a permit for grading or vegetation removal, future development of housing sites consistent with the HEU floating new zone program resulting in impacts to sensitive vegetation communities shall implement avoidance and minimization measures and provide suitable mitigation in accordance with the MHCP.</p> <p>Future project-level grading and site plans shall incorporate project design features to minimize direct impacts on sensitive vegetation communities including but not limited to riparian habitats, wetlands, non-native grassland, and coastal sage scrub. Mitigation for impacts to sensitive upland habitats shall occur in accordance with the mitigation ratios identified in Tables 4-6 and 4-7 of the MHCP. Mitigation for impacts to sensitive vegetation communities shall be implemented at the time future development projects are proposed.</p>	<p><u>Housing Strategy 1 (RM) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 2 (BYO) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 3- (MMUP) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>SMUP Alternative – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Less than Significant</u></p>

**Table S-1
Summary of Significant Environmental Analysis Results – HEU Housing Strategies 1-3 and the SMUP Alternative**

Environmental Issue	Results of Impact Analysis	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
<p>Issue 3: Wetlands</p> <p>Would the project have a have a substantial adverse effect on wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?</p>	<p>Impacts to jurisdictional waters and wetlands (Impact BIO-5) within housing sites ALT 4, ALT 5, ALT 7, C 6, L 4, L 7, NE 1, NE 3, O 2, O 4, O 5, O 6, OE 1, OE 2, and OE 7 within the following housing sites for each housing strategy and the SMUP Alternative would be potentially significant and, therefore, require mitigation.</p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 1 – Ready Made</u></p> <p><u>Development within housing strategy 1 (RM) has potential to impact:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wetlands and other jurisdictional waters on L-4, O-2, O-5, O-6, OE-1, and OE-7. <p><u>Housing Strategy 2 – Build Your Own</u></p> <p><u>Development within housing strategy 2 (BYO) has potential to impact:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wetlands and other jurisdictional waters on L-7, NE-1, NE-3, O-2, O-4, O-5, OE-2, and OE-7. <p><u>Housing Strategy 3 – Modified Mixed Use Places</u></p> <p><u>Development within housing strategy 3 (MMUP) has potential to impact:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wetlands and other jurisdictional waters on ALT-4, ALT-5, ALT-7, C-6, L-7, NE-1, O-2, O-4, OE-1, and OE-7. <p><u>SMUP Alternative</u></p> <p><u>Development within the SMUP Alternative has potential to impact:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wetlands and other jurisdictional waters on OE-1, OE-7, Alt-4, Alt-7, NE-1, and C-6. 	<p>BIO-5: Prior to issuance of a permit for grading or vegetation removal, future development of housing sites consistent with the HEU floating new zone program, wherein the City has determined the potential for impacts to sensitive biological resources, shall be required to prepare a site-specific biological resources survey. Should any potential jurisdictional waters be identified on-site during the general biological resources survey, then a jurisdictional wetlands delineation of the housing site shall be conducted following the methods outlined in the USACE’s 1987 Wetlands Delineation Manual and the Regional Supplement to the Corps of Engineers Delineation Manual for the Arid West Region. The limits of any riparian habitats on-site under the sole jurisdiction of CDFW shall also be delineated, as well as any special aquatic sites (excluding vernal pools) that may not meet Federal jurisdictional criteria but are regulated by CCC and the RWQCB.</p> <p>Avoidance measures based on project-level grading and site plans shall be incorporated into the project design to minimize direct impacts to jurisdictional waters consistent with Federal, State, and City guidelines. Unavoidable impacts to wetlands shall be minimized to the maximum extent practicable and would be subject to alternatives and mitigation analyses consistent with U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 404(b)(1) findings and procedures under the USACE’s permit process. Unavoidable impacts would require the in-kind creation of new wetland of the same type lost, at a ratio determined by the applicable regulatory agencies that would prevent any net loss of wetland functions and values. Wetland creation on-site or within the same wetland system shall be given preference over replacement off-site or within a different system. The City shall also control use and development in surrounding areas of influence to wetlands with the application of buffer zones. At a minimum, 100-foot-wide buffers shall be provided upland of tidal wetlands with the exception of riparian areas which will require 50-foot-wide buffers, unless the applicant demonstrates that a buffer of lesser width would protect the resources of the wetland based on site-specific information. Use and development within buffer areas shall be limited to minor passive recreational uses with fencing, desiltation or erosion control facilities, or other improvements</p>	<p><u>Housing Strategy 1 (RM) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 2 (BYO) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 3- (MMUP) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>SMUP Alternative – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Less than Significant</u></p>

**Table S-1
Summary of Significant Environmental Analysis Results – HEU Housing Strategies 1-3 and the SMUP Alternative**

Environmental Issue	Results of Impact Analysis	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
		<p>deemed necessary to protect the habitat, to be located in the upper (upland) half of the buffer when feasible. All wetlands and buffers shall be permanently conserved or protected through the application of an open space easement or other suitable device.</p> <p><u>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.</u></p>	
<p>Issue 4: Wildlife Corridors Would the project interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?</p>	<p>Housing strategies 1 (RM), 2 (BYO), and 3 (MMUP), and the SMUP Alternative would not impact any wildlife movement corridors, as no significant wildlife movement corridors occur in any of the housing sites. Therefore, there would be no inherent differences in impacts among the housing strategies.</p> <p><u>None</u> significant impacts associated with wildlife movement corridors would occur from housing strategies 1, 2, and 3, or the SMUP Alternative.</p>	<p>Impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.</p>	<p><u>Housing Strategy 1 (RM) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 2 (BYO) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 3- (MMUP) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>SMUP Alternative - Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Less than significant</u></p>

**Table S-1
Summary of Significant Environmental Analysis Results – HEU Housing Strategies 1-3 and the SMUP Alternative**

Environmental Issue	Results of Impact Analysis	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
<p>Issue 5: Habitat Conservation Planning</p> <p>Would the project conflict with the provisions of an adopted HCP, NCCP, or other approved local, regional, or state HCP?</p>	<p>Implementation of mitigation measures BIO-1 through BIO-4 would ensure project compliance with the MHCP. Therefore, there would be no impact to habitat conservation planning, and no inherent differences in impacts among the <u>three housing strategies or the SMUP Alternative</u>. <u>Impacts would be less than significant.</u></p>	<p>Impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.</p>	<p><u>Housing Strategy 1 (RM) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 2 (BYO) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 3- (MMUP) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>SMUP Alternative – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Less than significant</u></p>
<p>Issue 6: Policies and Ordinances Protecting Biological Resources</p> <p>Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</p>	<p>Housing strategies 1 (RM), 2 (BYO), and 3 (MMUP), <u>and the SMUP Alternative</u> would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, including the City’s adopted Tree Ordinance and Urban Forest Management Program. Therefore, there would be no inherent differences in impacts among the housing strategies. <u>Impacts would be less than significant.</u></p>	<p>Impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.</p>	<p><u>Housing Strategy 1 (RM) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 2 (BYO) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 3- (MMUP) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>SMUP Alternative - Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Less than significant</u></p>

**Table S-1
Summary of Significant Environmental Analysis Results – HEU Housing Strategies 1-3 and the SMUP Alternative**

Environmental Issue	Results of Impact Analysis	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
Cultural Resources			
<p>Issue 1: Historical Resources</p> <p>Would the project result in the alteration, including the adverse physical or aesthetic effects and/or the destruction of a prehistoric or historic structure, object or site?</p>	<p><u>There would be no inherent difference between housing strategies 1 (RM), 2 (BYO), and 3 (MMUP) for potential impacts to known historic structures and/or sites, or buildings/structures greater than 50 years old. As implementation of the HEU has the potential for development over the next 20+ years, most existing buildings or other structures within the housing sites would reach an age of 50 years or older during the buildout horizon of the HEU. Thus, any housing site that is presently developed has the potential to contain a historical structure(s) during the buildout horizon of the HEU. Impacts on the following sites would be potentially significant, and therefore, require mitigation. Potential direct impacts to historical resources (Impact CUL-1) within housing strategies 1 (RM), 2 (BYO), and 3 (MMUP) may be considered significant and would require mitigation.</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 1 – Ready Made (RM)</u></p> <p><u>Development within housing strategy 1 (RM) has potential to impact:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Known historic structures and/or sites on L-1 and OE-1; and</u> <u>Buildings or structures greater than 50 years old on C-2, C-3, C-7, L-1, L-2, L-5, L-6, NE-4, O-5, OE-4, OE-5 and OE-7.</u> <p><u>Housing Strategy 2 – Build Your Own (BYO)</u></p> <p><u>Development within housing strategy 2 (BYO) has potential to impact:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Known historic housing sites on L-1; and</u> <u>Buildings or structures greater than 50 years old on C-2, L-1, NE-1, NE-3, NE-7, O-5, OE-2, OE-7, and OE-8.</u> <p><u>Housing Strategy 3 – Modified Mixed Use Places (MMUP)</u></p> <p><u>Development within housing strategy 3 (MMUP) has potential to impact:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Known historic structures and/or sites on ALT-2, ALT-7 and OE-1; and</u> <u>Buildings or structures greater than 50 years old on ALT-2, ALT-3, ALT-4, ALT-6, C-1, C-2, C-6, NE-1, NE-7, O-3, OE-4, OE-7, and CBHMG-1.</u> <p><u>SMUP Alternative – The SMUP Alternative would include the following sites that have the potential for significant impacts to historical resources: OE-1, OE-4, OE-7, C-1, C-3, C-6, NE-1, NE-7, ALT-2, ALT-3, ALT-4, ALT-7, and O-3.</u></p>	<p>CUL-1: Applications for future development of housing sites consistent with the HEU floating new zone program, wherein the City has determined a potential for impacts to historical resources, shall be required to comply with the following mitigation framework:</p> <p>a) Prior to the issuance of any permit for a future development project, the age and original structural integrity and context of any buildings/structures occurring on the housing sites shall be verified. The project applicant shall submit in conjunction with the development permit application, verification of the age and original structural integrity of all on-site structures.</p> <p>b) For any building/structures in excess of 50 years of age having its original structural integrity intact, a qualified professional historian shall determine whether the affected building/structure is historically significant. The evaluation of historic architectural resources shall be based on criteria such as age, location, context, association with an important person or event, uniqueness, or structural integrity, as indicated in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5. A historical resource report shall be submitted by the project applicant to the City and shall include the methods used to determine the presence or absence of historical resources, identify potential impacts from the proposed project, and evaluate the significance of any historical resources identified.</p>	<p><u>Housing Strategy 1 (RM) – Significant and Unavoidable</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 2 (BYO) – Significant and Unavoidable</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 3- (MMUP) – Significant and Unavoidable</u></p> <p><u>SMUP Alternative - Significant and Unavoidable</u></p> <p><u>Significant and Unavoidable</u></p>

**Table S-1
Summary of Significant Environmental Analysis Results – HEU Housing Strategies 1-3 and the SMUP Alternative**

Environmental Issue	Results of Impact Analysis	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
<p>Issue 2: Archaeological Resources</p> <p>Would the project result in any impact to existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area?</p>	<p><u>While the HEU does not specifically propose alteration of a known archaeological resource or ground-disturbing activities such as grading or excavation, it can be assumed that future development of housing sites could have the potential to directly or indirectly impact undiscovered subsurface archaeological resources through such activities. The following housing sites consist, at least in part, of undeveloped land and/or have been mapped as having ‘high sensitivity’ for archaeological resources by the General Plan Resource Management Element (City of Encinitas 2011). Future development of these sites has the potential to significantly impact archaeological resources and therefore, would require mitigation (Impact CUL-2):</u> Potential direct and/or indirect impacts to archaeological resources within housing strategies 1, 2, and 3 (Impact CUL 2) would be considered significant and require mitigation.</p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 1 – Ready Made (RM)</u></p> <p><u>Development within housing strategy 1 (RM) has potential to impact:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Archaeological resources on L-4, O-2, O-5, O-6, OE-1, and OE-7.</u> <p><u>Housing Strategy 2 – Build Your Own (BYO)</u></p> <p><u>Development within housing strategy 2 (BYO) has potential to impact:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Archaeological resources on L-7, NE-3, O-2, O-4, O-5, OE-2, and OE-7.</u> <p><u>Housing Strategy 3 – Modified Mixed Use Places (MMUP)</u></p> <p><u>Development within housing strategy 3 (MMUP) has potential to impact:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Archaeological resources on ALT-4, ALT-5, C-6, L-7, O-2, O-4, OE-1, and OE-7.</u> <p><u>SMUP Alternative - Archeological resources on OE-1, OE-7, ALT-4, and C-6.</u></p>	<p>CUL-2: Applications for future development of housing sites consistent with the HEU floating-new zone program, wherein the City has determined a potential for impacts to historical resources, shall be required to comply with the following mitigation framework:</p> <p>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. <u>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 records 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.</u></p>	<p><u>Housing Strategy 1 (RM) – Significant and Unavoidable</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 2 (BYO) – Significant and Unavoidable</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 3- (MMUP) – Significant and Unavoidable</u></p> <p><u>SMUP Alternative - Significant and Unavoidable</u></p>

**Table S-1
Summary of Significant Environmental Analysis Results – HEU Housing Strategies 1-3 and the SMUP Alternative**

Environmental Issue	Results of Impact Analysis	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
<p>Issue 3: Paleontological Resources</p> <p><u>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?</u></p>	<p><u>While the HEU itself does not specifically propose ground-disturbing activities, future development projects consistent with the HEU that would grade housing sites with potential to contain undisturbed deposits of Torrey Sandstone and/or the Del Mar formation would have the potential to significantly impact subsurface paleontological resources (Impact CUL-3). Impacts would be considered significant if development of a housing site would require the excavation of over 1,000 cubic yards of a geologic formation with high resource potential to contain paleontological resources, excavation depths within the geologic formation of 10 feet or greater or over 2,000 cubic yards of a geologic formation with moderate resource potential to contain paleontological resources. The housing sites specified below may be underlain by geological formations that have moderate to high resource potential to contain paleontological resources. Future site-specific geotechnical studies would identify the geologic formations underlying these housing sites in conjunction with future development.</u></p> <p>Impacts to paleontological resources within housing strategies 1 (RM), 2 (BYO), and 3 (MMUP), and the SMUP Alternative (Impact CUL-3) would be <u>potentially</u> significant and therefore, require mitigation.</p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 1 – Ready Made (RM)</u></p> <p><u>Development within housing strategy 1 (RM) has potential to impact:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Paleontological resources on NE-4, O-2, O-5, O-6, OE-1, and OE-7.</u> <p><u>Housing Strategy 2 – Build Your Own (BYO)</u></p> <p><u>Development within housing strategy 2 (BYO) has potential to impact:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Paleontological resources on L-7, NE-3, NE-7, O-2, O-4, O-5, OE-2, OE-7, and OE-8.</u> <p><u>Housing Strategy 3 – Modified Mixed Use Places (MMUP)</u></p> <p><u>Development within housing strategy 3 (MMUP) has potential to impact:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Paleontological resources on ALT-3, ALT-4, ALT-5, ALT-6, ALT-7, C-6, L-7, NE-7, O-2, O-3, O-4, O-5, OE-1, and OE-7.</u> <p><u>SMUP Alternative</u> – Paleontological resources on: OE-1, OE-7, NE-7, ALT-3, ALT-4, ALT-7, O-3 and C-6.</p>	<p>CUL-3: Applications for future development of housing sites consistent with the HEU floating <u>new</u> zone program, wherein the City has determined a potential for impacts to paleontological resources, shall be required to comply with the following mitigation framework:</p> <p>A qualified paleontological monitor shall be present during grading on housing sites where development would require the excavation of over 1,000 cubic yards of a geologic formation with high resource potential to contain paleontological resources, excavation depths within the geologic formation of 10 feet or greater, or over 2,000 cubic yards of a geologic formation with moderate resource potential to contain paleontological resources. Geologic formations would be determined by a site-specific geotechnical study. The monitor shall have the authority to stop and/or divert grading, trenching, or excavating if a significant paleontological resource is encountered. An excavation plan shall be implemented to mitigate the discovery. Excavation shall include the salvage of the fossil remains (simple excavation or plaster-jacketing of larger and/or fragile specimens); recording stratigraphic and geologic data; and transport of fossil remains to laboratory for processing and curation.</p>	<p><u>Housing Strategy 1 (RM) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 2 (BYO) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 3- (MMUP) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>SMUP Alternative – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Less than Significant</u></p>

**Table S-1
Summary of Significant Environmental Analysis Results – HEU Housing Strategies 1-3 and the SMUP Alternative**

Environmental Issue	Results of Impact Analysis	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
<p>Issue 4: Human Remains</p> <p><u>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?</u></p>	<p><u>There are no known burial sites or cemeteries within the vicinity of the City. Therefore, it is not expected that human remains would be disturbed as a result of construction of the housing sites.</u></p> <p><u>In the unlikely event that human remains are discovered, then the provisions set forth in California Public Resources Code Section 5097.98 and State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 would be implemented in consultation with the assigned Most Likely Descendant as identified by the NAHC. No further construction activities would be permitted until the coroner is contacted, as well as any applicable Native American tribes. The City shall be required to comply with the California Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (2001) and the federal Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (1990). As regulations are in place to treat any inadvertent uncovering of human remains during grading, impacts to human remains would be less than significant.</u></p> <p>Although grading activities associated with development of all housing sites within housing strategies 1 through 3 <u>and the SMUP Alternative</u> has the potential to inadvertently uncover human remains, state regulations control the procedures that must take place under these circumstances. There would be no inherent differences in impacts among the housing strategies <u>or the SMUP Alternative</u>. As regulations are in place to treat any inadvertent uncovering of human remains during grading, impacts to human remains would be less than significant.</p>	<p>Impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.</p>	<p><u>Housing Strategy 1 (RM) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 2 (BYO) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 3- (MMUP) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>SMUP Alternative - Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Less than Significant</u></p>
Geology and Soils			
<p>Issue 1: Seismic Hazards</p> <p>Impacts related to geology and soils would be significant if the project would expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault (refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42); Strong seismic ground shaking; Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction; or Landslides. 	<p>Development of the housing sites in strategies 1 through 3 <u>and the SMUP Alternative</u> <u>have</u> the potential to result in impacts associated with risk of loss, injury, or death involving seismic hazards. Overall, there would be no inherent differences in impacts among the housing strategies. Impacts resulting from housing strategies 1 through 3 <u>and the SMUP Alternative</u> would be less than significant.</p> <p>Adherence to the CBC, City of Encinitas Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance, General Plan policies related to geology and soils, HEU policies (specifically 3.2, 3.7, and 3.10), and implementation of any recommendations described in a subsequent project’s geotechnical investigation would avoid or reduce potentially significant seismic and geological impacts to below a level of significance.</p>	<p>Impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.</p>	<p><u>Housing Strategy 1 (RM) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 2 (BYO) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 3- (MMUP) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>SMUP Alternative - Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Less than Significant</u></p>

**Table S-1
Summary of Significant Environmental Analysis Results – HEU Housing Strategies 1-3 and the SMUP Alternative**

Environmental Issue	Results of Impact Analysis	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
<p>Issue 2: Soil Erosion</p> <p>Impacts related to geology and soils would be significant if the project would result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.</p>	<p>Housing strategies 1 through 3 <u>and the SMUP Alternative</u> would result in soil erosion from future construction activities associated with development of the housing sites. Overall, there would be no inherent differences in impacts among the housing strategies. Impacts resulting from housing strategies 1 through 3 <u>and the SMUP Alternative</u> would be less than significant.</p> <p>Adherence to the CBC; City Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance; General Plan policies concerning soil erosion (see <u>Table 4.5-2</u>); and implementation of any recommendations described in subsequent project's SWPPP would avoid or reduce potentially significant soil erosion impacts to below a level of significance.</p>	<p>Impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.</p>	<p><u>Housing Strategy 1 (RM) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 2 (BYO) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 3- (MMUP) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>SMUP Alternative - Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Less than Significant</u></p>
<p>Issues 3 and 4: Unstable and Expansive Soils</p> <p>Impacts related to geology and soils would be significant if the project would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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; or • 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. 	<p>Housing strategies 1 through 3 <u>and the SMUP Alternative</u> may expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects involving unstable or expansive soils. Overall, there would be no inherent differences in impacts among the housing strategies <u>or the SMUP Alternative</u>. Impacts resulting from housing strategies 1 through 3 <u>and the SMUP Alternative</u> would be less than significant.</p> <p>Adherence to the CBC, City of Encinitas Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance, the City's General Plan policies, and implementation of any recommendations described in a site-specific geotechnical investigation would avoid or reduce potentially significant impacts related to unstable or expansive soils to below a level of significance.</p>	<p>Impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.</p>	<p><u>Housing Strategy 1 (RM) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 2 (BYO) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 3- (MMUP) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>SMUP Alternative - Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Less than Significant</u></p>

**Table S-1
Summary of Significant Environmental Analysis Results – HEU Housing Strategies 1-3 and the SMUP Alternative**

Environmental Issue	Results of Impact Analysis	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
Greenhouse Gas Emissions			
<p>Issue 1: GHG Emissions</p> <p>Would the project generate GHG emissions that may have a significant impact on the environment?</p>	<p><u>Buildout of housing strategy 1 (RM) would result in 42,599 MT CO2E per year, housing strategy 2 (BYO) would result in 46,241 MT CO2E per year, and buildout of housing strategy 3 (MMUP) would result in 55,458 MT CO2E per year. While the housing strategy 3 (MMUP) would result in the greatest overall emissions, it would result in the lowest per capita emissions among the housing strategies.</u></p> <p>No scientific or regulatory consensus exists regarding what particular quantity of GHG emissions is considered significant, and there remains no applicable, adopted numeric threshold for assessing the significance of a project’s emissions. Therefore, the numeric increase of GHG emissions by approximately 42,81242,599 to 55,86555,458 MT CO2E annually, is not a sufficiently informative or reliable indicator of the significance of the project’s GHG emissions. Therefore, as discussed, this analysis also considers compliance with regulatory programs intended to reduce GHG emissions in analyzing the significance of the HEU’s GHG emissions.</p> <p>Based on the analysis of the available regulatory programs, future development under the HEU <u>for housing strategies 1, 2, and 3</u> would result in significant impacts due to transportation, energy, water use, and area sources as described above.</p> <p><u>SMUP Alternative -. 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. 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 any strategy, future project details are unknown, and impacts would remain significant and unmitigated.</u></p>	<p>The following mitigation measure would address the GHG emission impacts at the program-level.</p> <p>GHG-1: Within six months of adopting the HEU, the City shall provide a revised land use plan to SANDAG to ensure that any revisions to the population and employment projections used in updating the SCS will accurately reflect anticipated growth due to the HEU.</p> <p>GHG-2: <u>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:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>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;</u> 2. <u>Quantified community and municipal GHG emissions inventories for a baseline year and business as usual emissions through 2050;</u> 3. <u>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;</u> 4. <u>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.</u> 	<p><u>Housing Strategy 1 (RM) – Significant and Unavoidable</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 2 (BYO) – Significant and Unavoidable</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 3- (MMUP) – Significant and Unavoidable</u></p> <p><u>SMUP Alternative - Significant and Unavoidable</u></p> <p><u>Significant and Unavoidable</u></p>

**Table S-1
Summary of Significant Environmental Analysis Results – HEU Housing Strategies 1-3 and the SMUP Alternative**

Environmental Issue	Results of Impact Analysis	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
		<p>Applications for future development of housing sites consistent with the HEU floating zone program shall be required to comply with the following mitigation framework:</p> <p>GHG-2: Demonstrate compliance with CalGreen Tier II standards.</p> <p>GHG-3: Multi family residential development shall provide energy star appliances, including refrigerators, stoves, and dishwashers.</p> <p>GHG-4: Include 1 electric vehicle charging station for every 50 parking spaces.</p> <p>GHG-5: Demonstrate a 25 percent reduction in outdoor water use.</p> <p><u>The timeline for preparation and adoption of the climate action plan shall include the following milestones:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Project Initiation/Public Scoping Meetings – 2 Months</u> • <u>Inventories and forecasts – 2 Months</u> • <u>Outreach and Public Scoping Meetings – 2 Months</u> • <u>Reduction Measures and Projections – 2 Months</u> • <u>Document Preparation – 2 Months</u> • <u>Environmental – 6 Months</u> • <u>Public Review – 1 Month</u> • <u>Response to Comments and Certification – 1 Month</u> • <u>Commission and City Council Public Hearings – 2 Months</u> <p><u>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.</u></p> <p><u>GHG-3:</u> <u>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 CO₂E 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.</u></p>	

**Table S-1
Summary of Significant Environmental Analysis Results – HEU Housing Strategies 1-3 and the SMUP Alternative**

Environmental Issue	Results of Impact Analysis	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
<p>Issue 2: Consistency with GHG Plans, Policies, and Regulations</p> <p>Would the project conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs?</p>	<p><u>The HEU would not conflict with any State regulation to reduce GHG emissions; it would not conflict with the most applicable plan, i.e., the Scoping Plan, nor policies as codified in AB 32 and stated in EO S-3-05 and B-30-15. Additionally, implementation of mitigation measure GHG-1 through GHG-3 would further reduce GHG emissions from future development under the HEU under any of the housing strategies 1-3 and the SMUP Alternative. Therefore, the project would not conflict with any applicable policy, plan, or regulation intended to reduction GHG emissions and the impact to GHG reduction policies, plans, and regulations would be less than significant. The HEU would not conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purposes of reducing the emissions of GHGs, and impacts would be less than significant.</u></p>	<p>Impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.</p>	<p><u>Housing Strategy 1 (RM) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 2 (BYO) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 3- (MMUP) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>SMUP Alternative – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Less than Significant</u></p>

**Table S-1
Summary of Significant Environmental Analysis Results – HEU Housing Strategies 1-3 and the SMUP Alternative**

Environmental Issue	Results of Impact Analysis	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
Hazards and Hazardous Resources			
<p>Issues 1, 2, and 3: Hazardous Materials— Use, Transport, Disposal; Accidental Release; and Emissions near a School</p> <p>Impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials would be significant if the project would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials; create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment; or emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.</p>	<p><u>Routine Use, Transport, and Disposal</u></p> <p><u>Future development consistent with housing strategies 1 (RM), 2 (BYO), 3 (MMUP), and the SMUP Alternative would not result in the routine transport, use, or disposal of substantial quantities of hazardous materials. Overall, there would be no inherent difference in impacts among the housing strategies relative to these issues. Impacts associated with the routine use, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials would be less than significant through compliance with local, State, and Federal regulations.</u></p> <p><u>Accidental Release (Impact HAZ-1)</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 1 – Ready Made (RM)</u></p> <p><u>Development within housing strategy 1 (RM) has potential to result in impacts from:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Development on or near known and potentially unknown hazardous material sites on C-2, C-3, C-7, L-1, L-2, L-4, L-5, L-6, NE-4, OE-1, OE4, and OE-5.</u> <p><u>Housing Strategy 2 – Build Your Own (BYO)</u></p> <p><u>Development within housing strategy 2 (BYO) has potential to result in impacts from:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Development on or near known and potentially unknown hazardous material sites on C-2, L-1, NE-3, NE-7, OE-2, and OE-7.</u> <p><u>Housing Strategy 3 – Modified Mixed Use Places (MMUP)</u></p> <p><u>Development within housing strategy 3 (MMUP) has potential to result in impacts from:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Development on or near known and potentially unknown hazardous material sites on ALT-2, ALT-3, ALT-5, ALT-6, ALT-7, C-1, C-2, CBHMG-3, NE-7, OE-1, OE-4, and OE-7.</u> <p><u>SMUP Alternative</u> - <u>The SMUP Alternative would include the following sites that have the potential for significant impacts associated with hazardous materials: C-1, C-3, OE-1, OE-4, OE-7, NE-7, ALT-2, ALT-3, and ALT-7.</u></p> <p><u>Emissions Near a School (Impact HAZ-2)</u></p> <p><u>Housing strategies 1 through 3 (RM, BYO, MMUP) and the SMUP Alternative all pose similar risks associated with accidental release or emissions near a school with regard to potentially unknown sources of hazardous materials both subsurface and within the existing on-site structures. Impacts associated with the routine use, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials would be less than significant through compliance with local, State, and Federal regulations.</u></p> <p><u>Impacts associated with the accidental release of hazardous materials and emissions near a school during future buildout of the housing sites for the three housing strategies and the SMUP Alternative would be potentially significant and, therefore, require mitigation.</u></p>	<p>Applications for future development of housing sites consistent with the HEU floating zone program, wherein the City has determined a potential for impacts relative to known and unknown hazardous materials sites, shall be required to comply with the following mitigation framework:</p> <p>HAZ-1: Future projects shall be required to identify potential conditions, which require further regulatory oversight and demonstrate compliance based on the following measures prior to issuance of any permits:</p> <p>A. A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) shall be completed in accordance with American Society of Testing and Materials (ASTM) Standards. If hazardous materials are identified requiring remediation, a Phase II ESA and remediation effort shall be conducted in conformance with Federal, State, and local regulations.</p> <p>B. If the Phase II ESA identifies the need for remediation, then the following shall occur prior to the issuance of grading permits:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The applicant shall retain a qualified environmental engineer to develop a soil and/or groundwater management plan to address the notification, monitoring, sampling, testing, handling, storage, and disposal of contaminated media or substances (soil, groundwater). The qualified environmental consultant shall monitor excavations and grading activities in accordance with the plan. The groundwater management and monitoring plans shall be approved by the City prior to development of the site. The applicant shall submit documentation showing that contaminated soil and/or groundwater on proposed development parcels have been avoided or remediated to meet cleanup requirements established by appropriate local regulatory agencies (Regional Water Quality Control Board [RWQCB]/DTSC/DEH) based on the future planned land use of the specific area within the boundaries of the site (i.e., commercial, residential), and that the risk to human health of future occupants of these areas therefore has been reduced to below a level of significance. 	<p><u>Housing Strategy 1 (RM) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 2 (BYO) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 3- (MMUP) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>SMUP Alternative - Less than Significant</u></p>

**Table S-1
Summary of Significant Environmental Analysis Results – HEU Housing Strategies 1-3 and the SMUP Alternative**

Environmental Issue	Results of Impact Analysis	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
		<p>c. The applicant shall obtain written authorization from the appropriate regulatory agency (RWQCB/DTSC/DEH) confirming the completion of remediation. A copy of the authorization shall be submitted to the City to confirm that all appropriate remediation has been completed and that the proposed development parcel has been cleaned up to the satisfaction of the regulatory agency. In the situation where previous contamination has occurred on a site that has a previously closed case or on a site included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, the DEH shall be notified of the proposed land use.</p> <p>d. All cleanup activities shall be performed in accordance with all applicable Federal, State, and local laws and regulations, and required permits shall be secured prior to commencement of construction to the satisfaction of the City and compliance with applicable regulatory agencies such as but not limited to the Encinitas Municipal Code.</p>	
<p>Issue 4: Hazardous Materials—Sites</p> <p>Impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials would be significant if the project would be located on a site, which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would create a significant hazard to the public or environment.</p>	<p>No sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 are present on the housing sites. Impacts would be less than significant <u>for housing strategies 1 through 3 and the SMUP Alternative.</u></p>	<p>Impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.</p>	<p><u>Housing Strategy 1 (RM) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 2 (BYO) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 3- (MMUP) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>SMUP Alternative – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Less than Significant</u></p>

**Table S-1
Summary of Significant Environmental Analysis Results – HEU Housing Strategies 1-3 and the SMUP Alternative**

Environmental Issue	Results of Impact Analysis	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
<p>Issue 5: Emergency Response and Evacuation Plans</p> <p>Impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials would be significant if the project would impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.</p>	<p>Housing strategies 1 through 3 <u>and the SMUP Alternative</u> would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Overall, there would be no inherent differences in impacts among the housing strategies.</p> <p>Potential impacts associated with the interference of emergency response plans would be less than significant <u>for housing strategies 1 through 3 and the SMUP Alternative.</u></p>	<p>Impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.</p>	<p><u>Housing Strategy 1 (RM) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 2 (BYO) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 3- (MMUP) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>SMUP Alternative – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Less than Significant</u></p>
<p>Issue 6: Wildland Fires</p> <p>Impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials would be significant if the project would expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas, within brush fire management zones, or where residences are intermixed with wildlands.</p>	<p>Overall, there would be no inherent differences in impacts among the <u>housing strategies 1 through 3 and the SMUP Alternative.</u> Adherence to the state and local fire codes and City Design Guidelines would reduce risks in conjunction with future development related to wildland fire.</p> <p>Potential impacts associated with wildland fire would be avoided through the implementation of existing local and state regulations. Mandatory compliance with these regulations would ensure that impacts would be less than significant <u>for housing strategies 1 through 3 and the SMUP Alternative.</u></p>	<p>Impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.</p>	<p><u>Housing Strategy 1 (RM) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 2 (BYO) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 3- (MMUP) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>SMUP Alternative – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Less than Significant</u></p>

**Table S-1
Summary of Significant Environmental Analysis Results – HEU Housing Strategies 1-3 and the SMUP Alternative**

Environmental Issue	Results of Impact Analysis	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
Hydrology and Water Quality			
<p>Issues 1 and 6: Water Quality</p> <p>Impacts related to water quality would be significant if the project would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or Otherwise substantially degrade water quality. 	<p><u>Development of all housing sites within housing strategies 1 through 3 and the SMUP Alternative have the potential to increase the level of runoff and pollutants discharged to water bodies in the project area. There would be no inherent differences in impacts among the housing strategies.</u></p> <p>While development of the housing sites has the potential to increase the amount of pollutants discharged into surface waters, all development would be subject to federal, state, and local regulations aimed at controlling water quality impacts. Thus, substantial adverse water quality impacts would be avoided and impacts resulting from buildout of the HEU would be less than significant <u>for the three housing strategies and the SMUP Alternative.</u></p>	<p>Impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.</p>	<p><u>Housing Strategy 1 (RM) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 2 (BYO) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 3- (MMUP) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>SMUP Alternative – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Less than Significant</u></p>
<p>Issue 2: Groundwater</p> <p>Impacts related to groundwater would be significant if the project would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Substantially deplete ground water supplies or interfere substantially with ground water recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local ground water table level (e.g., the production rate of 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). 	<p><u>Development of all housing sites under housing strategies 1 through 3 and the SMUP Alternative have the potential to increase impermeable surfaces and decrease groundwater discharge. There would be no inherent differences in impacts among the housing strategies.</u></p> <p>While future development of the housing sites has the potential to increase impervious surfaces and decrease groundwater infiltration, requirements for LID and BMPs would reduce impacts. Therefore, impacts on groundwater levels and groundwater recharge resulting from buildout of the housing sites would be less than significant <u>for the three housing strategies and the SMUP Alternative.</u></p>	<p>Impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.</p>	<p><u>Housing Strategy 1 (RM) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 2 (BYO) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 3- (MMUP) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>SMUP Alternative – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Less than Significant</u></p>

**Table S-1
Summary of Significant Environmental Analysis Results – HEU Housing Strategies 1-3 and the SMUP Alternative**

Environmental Issue	Results of Impact Analysis	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
<p>Issues 3, 4, and 5: Drainage Pattern/Runoff</p> <p>Impacts related to drainage and runoff would be significant if the project would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in a substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site; Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site; or Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. 	<p><u>Development of all housing sites within housing strategies 1 through 3 and the SMUP Alternative would be consistent with the drainage patterns in the City and handled through the storm drain system. There would be no inherent differences in impacts among the housing strategies.</u></p> <p>Future development would conform to applicable federal, state, and City regulatory standards to effectively avoid and/or address potentially significant impacts related to hydrology; therefore, drainage and runoff impacts would be less than significant <u>for the three housing strategies and the SMUP Alternative.</u></p>	<p>Impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.</p>	<p><u>Housing Strategy 1 (RM) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 2 (BYO) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 3- (MMUP) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>SMUP Alternative – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Less than Significant</u></p>

**Table S-1
Summary of Significant Environmental Analysis Results – HEU Housing Strategies 1-3 and the SMUP Alternative**

Environmental Issue	Results of Impact Analysis	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
<p>Issues 7, 8, 9, and 10: Flooding/Inundation</p> <p>Impacts related to flooding and inundation would be significant if the project would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or FIRM or other flood hazard delineation map; Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows; 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 Result in inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. 	<p>Buildout of the housing sites would result in less than significant impacts relative to flooding associated with floodplains, seiche, tsunami and mudflow.</p> <p>Impacts associated with buildout of housing sites C-6, O-2, and O-4 would be potentially significant relative to dam inundation (Impact HYD-1).- <u>In addition, impacts associated with buildout of housing sites ALT-2, ALT-6, ALT-7, L-1, L-2, and OE-2 would be potentially significant relative to flooding (Impact HYD-1), and therefore, require mitigation.-</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 1 – Ready Made (RM)</u></p> <p><u>Development within housing strategy 1 (RM) has potential for impacts related to:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Flood hazard areas on L-1 and L-2; and</u> <u>Dam failure on O-2.</u> <p><u>Housing Strategy 2 – Build Your Own (BYO)</u></p> <p><u>Development within housing strategy 2 (BYO) has potential to impact:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Flood hazard areas on L-1 and OE-2; and</u> <u>Dam failure on O-2 and O-4.</u> <p><u>Housing Strategy 3 – Modified Mixed-Use Places (MMUP)</u></p> <p><u>Development within housing strategy 3 (MMUP) has potential to impact:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Flood hazard areas on ALT-2, ALT-6, and ALT-7; and</u> <u>Dam failure on C-6, O-2 and O-4.</u> <p><u>SMUP Alternative –</u></p> <p><u>Development within the SMUP Alternative has the potential to impact:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Flood hazard areas on ALT-2 and ALT-7; and</u> <u>Dam failure on C-6</u> 	<p>The following mitigation framework applies to housing sites C-6, O-2, and O-4.</p> <p>HYD-1: Applications for future development on housing sites C-6, O-2 and O-4 <u>consistent with the new zone program, wherein the City has determined a potential for flooding impacts, shall be reviewed by the City for compliance with applicable components of the City’s Floodplain Management Regulations, specifically Section 23.40.051, which includes standards for construction in areas of special flood hazard. All future development on housing sites located within consistent with the new zone program, located within</u> mapped dam inundation areas, shall be designed to reduce potential flooding hazards subject to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.</p>	<p><u>Housing Strategy 1 (RM) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 2 (BYO) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 3- (MMUP) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>SMUP Alternative – Less than Significant</u></p> <p>Less than Significant</p>

**Table S-1
Summary of Significant Environmental Analysis Results – HEU Housing Strategies 1-3 and the SMUP Alternative**

Environmental Issue	Results of Impact Analysis	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
Land Use and Planning			
<p>Issue 1: Land Use Plans or Policies</p> <p>Would the project conflict with any applicable land use plan or policy of an agency with jurisdiction over the project?</p>	<p><u>The project includes design guidelines that illustrate principles for community compatibility requiring new construction to be tailored to the unique characteristics of each of the City’s five distinct communities. The design guidelines would apply to the new zone and the character contexts (R30, X30, and S30). The new zone development standards and design guidelines were created in tandem and are designed to work together.</u></p> <p><u>Although the land uses proposed under each housing strategy would differ, housing strategies 1 - Ready-Made (RM), 2 – Build Your Own (BYO), 3 – Modified Mixed-Use Places (MMUP), or the SMUP Alternative would all allow higher density housing and changes to existing land uses. There would be no inherent differences in impacts among the housing strategies.</u></p> <p><u>Overall, application of the new zone program coupled with strict design guidelines assures that new development under the HEU would be consistent with the City’s Municipal and Zoning Code and impacts would be less than significant under any of the housing strategies or the SMUP Alternative.</u></p> <p><u>Implementation of any of the housing strategies would be mostly consistent with regional and local plans and policies. Impacts associated with the project’s conflict with any applicable land use plan or policy would be less than significant.</u></p>	<p>Impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.</p>	<p><u>Housing Strategy 1 (RM) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 2 (BYO) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 3- (MMUP) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>SMUP Alternative – Less than Significant</u></p>
<p>Issue 2: State Planning Initiatives</p> <p>Would the project conflict with State Planning Initiatives?</p>	<p><u>Each housing strategy would result in different VMT and efficiency rankings; however, there would be no inherent differences in impacts among the housing strategies 1-3 or the SMUP Alternative.</u></p> <p><u>Implementation of any of the housing strategies or the SMUP Alternative would be consistent with state planning initiatives. Impacts would be less than significant.</u></p>	<p>Impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.</p>	<p><u>Housing Strategy 1 (RM) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 2 (BYO) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 3- (MMUP) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>SMUP Alternative – Less than Significant</u></p>

**Table S-1
Summary of Significant Environmental Analysis Results – HEU Housing Strategies 1-3 and the SMUP Alternative**

Environmental Issue	Results of Impact Analysis	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
<p>Issue 3: Neighborhood Compatibility</p> <p>Would the project result in substantial neighborhood compatibility impacts associated with significant traffic, noise, or aesthetics impacts?</p>	<p>a. Traffic Impacts</p> <p><u>Although buildout under each housing strategy would result in somewhat different specific traffic impacts, housing strategies 1 (RM), 2 (BYO), 3 (MMUP), and the SMUP Alternative would all allow higher density housing, increased commercial development and changes to existing land uses resulting in increased traffic. There would be no inherent differences in impacts among the housing strategies. As discussed in Section 4.13, the HEU would allow the development of new residential and mixed-use uses throughout the City, resulting in a significant impact relative decrease into the LOS of existing roadways and intersections. Neighborhood incompatibility impacts from such traffic generation would be significant (Impact LU-1).</u></p> <p>b. Noise Impacts</p> <p><u>Housing strategies 1 (RM), 2 (BYO), 3 (MMUP), and the SMUP Alternative would not result in a substantial increase in ambient noise; however, on-site generation noise could be significant (see Impact NOS-1). There would be no inherent differences in impacts among the housing strategies. Ambient noise impacts were assessed by comparing future noise levels without implementation of the HEU and future noise levels with building of the housing strategies. As shown, when compared to buildout of the no project condition, the increases in ambient noise would be less than 3 decibels adjacent to all roadway segments. Impacts would be less than significant.</u></p> <p>The HEU would allow the development of new residential uses adjacent to existing commercial and retail uses, or in the context of the mixed use sites sometimes within the same structure as noise-generating commercial uses. As discussed in Section 4.10, noise levels resulting from existing and proposed noise-generating uses (i.e., commercial uses) could expose new noise-sensitive uses to noise levels in excess of the City’s standards. Neighborhood incompatibility impacts from such noise generation would be significant (Impact LU-2).</p> <p>c. Aesthetic Impacts</p> <p><u>Housing strategies 1 (RM), 2 (BYO), 3 (MMUP), and the SMUP Alternative would all allow higher density housing and changes to existing land uses. Implementation of the HEU on housing sites O-4, O-5, and L-7 would result in significant impacts to community character. Housing sites O-4 and L-7 are located within housing strategies 2 (BYO) and 3 (MMUP) and housing site O-5 is located within housing strategies 1 (RM) and 2 (BYO). Therefore, there would be no inherent differences in impacts among housing strategies 1-3. The SMUP Alternative does not include any of these sites and would not be affected. The HEU would allow development of new uses throughout existing communities of the City. While the application of zoning regulations and design guidelines would allow most development to be compatible with the existing community characters throughout the City, development of housing sites L-7, O-4 and O-5 would result in significant impacts to not meet community character through housing strategies 1-3 standards. Neighborhood incompatibility impacts from such the development of these locations housing sites would be significant. These impacts are discussed in Section 4.1.7 and identified as Impacts V-2, V-3, and V-4.</u></p>	<p>a. Traffic Impacts</p> <p>The mitigation framework and improvements required to reduce the potentially significant traffic impacts associated with the implementation of the HEU are detailed in Section 4.12.5.3.</p> <p>b. Noise Impacts</p> <p>Mitigation measure NOS-1, as detailed in Section 4.10.6.3, is required to be implemented to reduce significant impacts associated with on-site noise.</p> <p>c. Aesthetic Impacts</p> <p>As the floating new zone standards and design guidelines are intended to maximize consistency with the surrounding land use context and character of individual neighborhoods, the project already incorporates features to maximize protection of community character to the extent feasible. Thus, no further mitigation has been identified at the program level to minimize the adverse impact resulting from development of sites L-7 (Impact VIS-2), O-4 (Impact VIS-3), and O-5 (Impact VIS-4).</p>	<p>a. Traffic Impacts – <u>Housing Strategy 1 (RM) – Significant and Unavoidable</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 2 (BYO) – Significant and Unavoidable</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 3- (MMUP) – Significant and Unavoidable</u></p> <p><u>SMUP Alternative - Significant and Unavoidable</u></p> <p>b. Noise Impacts <u>Housing Strategy 1 (RM) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 2 (BYO) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 3- (MMUP) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>SMUP Alternative – Less than Significant</u></p> <p>c. Aesthetic Impacts – Significant and Unavoidable</p>

**Table S-1
Summary of Significant Environmental Analysis Results – HEU Housing Strategies 1-3 and the SMUP Alternative**

Environmental Issue	Results of Impact Analysis	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
			<u>c. Aesthetic Impacts</u> <u>Housing Strategy 1 (RM) – Significant and Unavoidable</u> <u>Housing Strategy 2 (BYO) – Significant and Unavoidable</u> <u>Housing Strategy 3- (MMUP) – Significant and Unavoidable</u> <u>SMUP Alternative – Less than Significant</u>

**Table S-1
Summary of Significant Environmental Analysis Results – HEU Housing Strategies 1-3 and the SMUP Alternative**

Environmental Issue	Results of Impact Analysis	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
<p>Issue 4: Proximity to Agricultural Sites</p> <p>Would the project result in land use conflicts in relation to the proximity of housing to existing agricultural uses/commodity sites (i.e., indirect impacts associated with pesticides, fugitive dust, noise, etc.)?</p>	<p><u>The City does not support a large amount of agricultural operations; however, the City does have agricultural areas, composed primarily of greenhouses, scattered throughout the central and eastern portions of the City. Housing sites that are on or adjacent to agricultural commodity parcels include L-5, L-6, and L-7. Specifically, housing sites L-5 and L-6 have been identified as areas of current agricultural use (greenhouses). Site L-7 is located adjacent to greenhouse sites. Development of these housing sites in accordance with the HEU would require either demolition of the greenhouses or residences placed in close proximity to the greenhouse operations. In either scenario, construction of housing units could result in impacts associated with the interface between agricultural operations and residential uses.</u></p> <p><u>Most activities associated with greenhouse cultivation would be contained within a controlled environment. The type of agriculture practiced on these housing sites would therefore be compatible with urban land uses, and impacts would be less than significant.</u></p> <p><u>Housing sites L-5 and L-6 are part of housing strategy 1 (RM). Housing site L-7 is part of housing strategy 2 (BYO) and housing strategy 3 (MMUP). Therefore, implementation of any of the strategies would have a potential agricultural interface compatibility issue. There would be no inherent differences in impacts among the housing strategies.</u></p> <p>The HEU could allow the development of new uses adjacent to existing agricultural (greenhouse) operations. Due to the nature of such operations, land use conflicts in relation to the proximity of housing to existing agricultural uses would be less than significant <u>for housing strategies 1-3.</u></p> <p><u>Sites L-5, L-6, and L-7 are not part of the SMUP Alternative. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant under this alternative.</u></p>	<p>Impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.</p>	<p><u>Housing Strategy 1 (RM) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 2 (BYO) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 3- (MMUP) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>SMUP Alternative – Less than Significant. Less than Significant</u></p>
<p>Issue 5: Noise/Land Use Compatibility</p> <p>Would the project result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan?</p>	<p><u>Impacts associated with exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan would be potentially significant under all three of the housing strategies and the SMUP Alternative, and therefore, require mitigation.</u></p> <p>All of the housing sites are located adjacent to roadways or freeways that would generate noise levels greater than the City’s normally acceptable compatibility level of 60 L_{dn}. Additionally, many of the housing sites are located adjacent to roadways or freeways that would generate noise levels greater than 70 L_{dn}. This is in excess of the City’s conditionally acceptable exterior noise compatibility level. Site-specific exterior noise analyses that demonstrate that the project would not place sensitive receptors in locations where the exterior existing or future noise levels would exceed the noise compatibility guidelines of the City’s General Plan would be required. Because no specific projects are proposed at this time, noise control measures cannot be practically designed, and impacts would be potentially significant (Impact LU-3).</p> <p>Future project’s implemented under the HEU floating new -zone and located where exterior noise levels exceed 60 L_{dn} would be required to demonstrate compliance with Title 24 requirements as a part of the permitting process. Thus, interior noise impacts would be less than significant <u>under any of the housing strategies or the SMUP Alternative.</u></p>	<p>Applications for future development of housing sites consistent with the HEU floating new zone program, wherein the City has determined a potential for noise impacts, shall be required to comply with the following mitigation framework:</p> <p>LU-1: As part of the City’s design review and entitlement process for housing sites, to the extent practicable, the City should avoid siting sensitive exterior areas associated with future residential uses within the 70 L_{dn} exterior traffic noise contour distances to the extent practicable and in consideration of other Zoning Standards and Design Guidelines. If sensitive receptors are to be located within the 70 L_{dn} exterior noise contour, outdoor activity areas shall be shielded from the noise source using site design measures such as building orientation or sound walls to maintain a 70 L_{dn} exterior noise level for noise sensitive exterior areas.</p>	<p><u>Housing Strategy 1 (RM) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 2 (BYO) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 3- (MMUP) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>SMUP Alternative – Less than Significant. Less than Significant</u></p>

**Table S-1
Summary of Significant Environmental Analysis Results – HEU Housing Strategies 1-3 and the SMUP Alternative**

Environmental Issue	Results of Impact Analysis	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
Noise			
<p>Issue 1: Ambient Noise Levels</p> <p>Would the project result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient traffic noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</p>	<p>It should be noted that there would be an increase in existing ambient noise levels with or without buildout of the housing strategies <u>or SMUP Alternative</u>. This is due to the increase in regional growth that would occur with or without implementation of the proposed HEU. Impacts were assessed by comparing future noise levels without implementation of the HEU and future noise levels with buildout of the three housing strategies <u>and SMUP Alternative</u>. As shown, <u>When compared to buildout of the no project condition, the increases in ambient noise would be less than 3 dB adjacent to all roadway segments. Impacts would be less than significant for the three housing strategies and the SMUP Alternative.</u></p>	<p>Impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.</p>	<p><u>Housing Strategy 1 (RM) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 2 (BYO) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 3- (MMUP) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>SMUP Alternative – Less than Significant</u></p>
<p>Issue 2: On-Site Generated Noise</p> <p>Would the project result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of limits established in the noise ordinance?</p>	<p><u>Development of the housing sites in all three housing strategies and the SMUP Alternative have the potential to result in impacts associated with on-site generated noise (Impact NOS-1). Overall, there would be no inherent differences in impacts among the housing strategies. Impacts resulting from all three housing strategies and the SMUP Alternative would be potentially significant, and therefore, require mitigation.</u></p> <p>Stationary sources of noise include activities associated with a given land use. Future on-site generated noise sources have the potential to exceed to property line noise levels limits established in the City’s Noise Ordinance. Without detailed operational data, it cannot be verified that future projects implemented in accordance with the HEU would be capable of reducing noise levels to comply with the City’s Noise Ordinance property line standards. Impacts may be significant <u>under any of the housing strategies and the SMUP Alternative (Impact NOS-1).</u></p>	<p>NOS-1: Prior to the issuance of any permit for future development consistent with the HEU Floating Zone Program <u>new zone program</u>, whereon residential development would be located adjacent to commercial uses, the City shall require site-specific noise studies to determine if on-site generated noise levels exceed the property line noise level limits in the Noise Ordinance and to present appropriate mitigation measures, which may include, but are not limited to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Require the placement of loading and unloading areas so that commercial buildings shield nearby residential land uses from noise generated by loading dock and delivery activities. If necessary, additional sound barriers shall be constructed on the commercial sites to protect nearby noise sensitive uses and hours of delivery can be limited if determined as needed through the study. Require the placement of all commercial HVAC machinery to be placed within mechanical equipment rooms wherever possible. Require the provision of localized noise barriers or rooftop parapets around HVAC, cooling towers, and mechanical equipment so that line-of-sight to the noise source from the property line of the noise sensitive receptors is blocked. 	<p><u>Housing Strategy 1 (RM) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 2 (BYO) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 3- (MMUP) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>SMUP Alternative – Less than Significant</u></p>

**Table S-1
Summary of Significant Environmental Analysis Results – HEU Housing Strategies 1-3 and the SMUP Alternative**

Environmental Issue	Results of Impact Analysis	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
<p>Issue 3: Temporary Noise</p> <p>Would the project result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</p>	<p><u>Housing Strategy 1 – Ready Made (RM)</u></p> <p><u>Housing strategy 1 (RM) has potential to result in significant temporary noise impacts due to construction activities at the following housing sites: C-7, L-2, L-6, and OE-5 (Impact NOS-2).</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 2 – Build Your Own (BYO)</u></p> <p><u>The residential land uses located adjacent to the housing sites associated with housing strategy 2 (BYO) are located more than 110 feet from the acoustic center of construction activities. Thus, construction noise levels at the residential properties located adjacent to these housing sites would not exceed 75 dB(A) Leq(8). (Impact NOS-2).</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 3 – Modified Mixed Use Places (MMUP)</u></p> <p><u>Housing strategy 3 (MMUP) has potential to result in significant temporary noise impacts due to construction activities at the following housing sites: ALT-2, ALT-7, and CBHMG-1 (Impact NOS-2).</u></p> <p><u>SMUP Alternative</u></p> <p><u>The SMUP Alternative has the potential to result in significant temporary noise impacts due to construction activities at the following sites: ALT-2 and ALT-7 (Impact NOS-2).</u></p> <p>Housing strategy 1 (RM) has the potential to result in significant temporary noise impacts due to construction activities at four housing sites (C-7, L-2, L-6, and OE-5) and housing strategy 3 (MMUP) has potential to result in significant temporary noise impacts due to construction activities at three housing sites (ALT-2, ALT-7, and CBHMG-1).</p> <p>Average construction noise levels at these housing sites would exceed the limit of 75 dB(A) Leq(8) established in the City’s Municipal Code. Temporary noise impacts due to construction activities would be potentially significant (Impact NOS-2).</p> <p>The residential land uses located adjacent to the housing sites associated with housing strategy 2 are located more than 110 feet from the acoustic center of construction activities. Thus, construction noise levels at the residential properties located adjacent to these housing sites would not exceed 75 dB(A) Leq</p>	<p>NOS-2: <u>Prior to the issuance of future construction permits at the housing sites, a Construction Noise Control Plan shall be submitted to the City’s Planning and Building Department for review and approval. The plan shall demonstrate that all construction activity shall be in compliance with noise standards provided in Section 9.32 of the City’s Municipal Code. The construction noise control plan can include, but is not limited to, the following: Future projects shall ensure through contract specifications that a construction noise control plan, which demonstrates compliance with City standards and includes construction best management practices (BMPs) is in place and be implemented by the City prior to issuance of a grading or building permit for future development consistent with the HEU Floating Zone Program (whichever is issued first). The construction noise control plan can include, but is not limited to, the following:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that construction equipment is properly muffled according to industry standards and is in good working condition. • Place noise-generating construction equipment and locate construction staging areas away from sensitive uses, where feasible. • Implement noise attenuation measures to the extent feasible, which may include, but are not limited to, temporary noise barriers or noise blankets around stationary construction noise sources. • Use electric air compressors and similar power tools rather than diesel equipment, where feasible • Construction-related equipment, including heavy-duty equipment, motor vehicles, and portable equipment, shall be turned off when not in use for more than 5 minutes. • Construction shall be limited to the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. Monday through Saturday. No construction is permitted on Sundays or legal holidays. 	<p><u>Housing Strategy 1 (RM) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 2 (BYO) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 3- (MMUP) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>SMUP Alternative – Less than Significant</u></p> <p>Less than Significant</p>

**Table S-1
Summary of Significant Environmental Analysis Results – HEU Housing Strategies 1-3 and the SMUP Alternative**

Environmental Issue	Results of Impact Analysis	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construction hours, allowable workdays, and the phone number of the job superintendent shall be clearly posted at all construction entrances to allow for surrounding owners and residents to contact the job superintendent. If the CityCounty or the job superintendent receives a complaint, the superintendent shall investigate, take appropriate corrective action, and report the action taken to the reporting party. Project developers shall require by contract specifications that heavily loaded trucks used during construction would be routed away from residential streets to the extent feasible. Contract specifications shall be included in construction documents, which shall be reviewed by the City prior to issuance of a grading permit. 	
<p>Issue 4: Groundborne Noise and Vibration</p> <p>Would the project result in the generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</p>	<p>No operational components of future development consistent with the HEU floating new zone would include significant groundborne noise or vibration sources. Operational vibration impacts would be less than significant <u>under the three housing strategies and the SMUP Alternative.</u></p> <p>The construction activities that generate excessive vibrations are blasting and impact pile driving. Projects implemented under the HEU would be constructed using typical construction techniques; no blasting is contemplated. Heavy construction equipment (e.g., bulldozer and excavator) would generate a limited amount of groundborne vibration during construction activities at short distances away from the source, and would not be a significant source of excessive vibration. Non-pile driving or foundation work construction phases that have the highest potential of producing vibration (such as jackhammering and other high power tools) would be intermittent and would only occur for short periods of time for any individual project site. Therefore, the project would not expose persons to excessive ground-borne vibration, and as such, impacts would be less than significant <u>under the three housing strategies and the SMUP Alternative.</u></p>	<p>Impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required. .</p>	<p><u>Housing Strategy 1 (RM) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 2 (BYO) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 3- (MMUP) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>SMUP Alternative – Less than Significant</u></p> <p>Less than Significant</p>

**Table S-1
Summary of Significant Environmental Analysis Results – HEU Housing Strategies 1-3 and the SMUP Alternative**

Environmental Issue	Results of Impact Analysis	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
Population and Housing			
<p>Issue 1: Population Growth</p> <p>Would the project unduly concentrate population growth to an area not capable of supporting it?</p>	<p>Future projects implemented in accordance with any of the HEU strategies would be required to adhere to the General Plan, provide required development impact fees, and comply with applicable development regulations. Ultimately, all future projects would be required to provide a will-serve letter from the service provider in conjunction with their application to ensure adequate services and utilities are available. Thus population growth associated with the HEU would be within an area capable of supporting it; impacts would be less than significant. Overall, there would be no inherent differences in impacts among the <u>three housing strategies and the SMUP Alternative. Impacts would be less than significant.</u></p>	<p>Impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.</p>	<p><u>Housing Strategy 1 (RM) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 2 (BYO) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 3- (MMUP) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>SMUP Alternative – Less than Significant</u></p>
<p>Issue 2: Displacement of People</p> <p>Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing housing or people through redevelopment, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</p>	<p><u>Buildout of the housing sites would accommodate an increase in population over the existing condition. The majority of new development anticipated on housing sites is expected to intensify existing development and result in additional housing units. While people may be displaced during redevelopment, it would be temporary considering buildout of the housing sites would accommodate the projected population for the City through 2035. Therefore, displacement of people associated with implementation of the HEU would be less than significant for the three housing strategies and the SMUP Alternative..</u></p> <p><u>The HEU would result in an increase in housing units in the City. While a temporary loss of existing housing could occur during construction, it would not necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. Impacts would be less than significant. Overall, there would be no inherent differences in impacts among the housing strategies.</u></p>	<p>Impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.</p>	<p><u>Housing Strategy 1 (RM) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 2 (BYO) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 3- (MMUP) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>SMUP Alternative – Less than Significant</u></p>

**Table S-1
Summary of Significant Environmental Analysis Results – HEU Housing Strategies 1-3 and the SMUP Alternative**

Environmental Issue	Results of Impact Analysis	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
Public Services and Facilities			
<p>Issue 1a: Fire Service</p> <p>Would the project promote growth patterns resulting in the need for and/or provision of new or physically altered fire emergency facilities in order to maintain service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives and the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts?</p>	<p><u>Housing strategies 1 – Ready Made (RM), 2 – Build-Your-Own (BYO), 3 – Modified Mixed-Use Place (MMUP), and the SMUP Alternative would not result in any need to construct new facilities. Therefore, there would be no inherent differences in impacts among the housing strategies.</u></p> <p>No new or expanded emergency response facilities are required in conjunction with the HEU. General Plan conformance, as well as the and implementation of the regulatory fire mitigation fee pursuant to Title 23 of the City’s Municipal Code <u>will assure</u> assure that future projects maintain adequate levels of service. At this programmatic level, impacts would be less than significant <u>for housing strategies 1-3 and the SMUP Alternative.</u></p>	<p>Impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.</p>	<p><u>Housing Strategy 1 (RM) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 2 (BYO) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 3- (MMUP) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>SMUP Alternative – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Less than Significant</u></p>
<p>Issue 1b: Police Service</p> <p>Would the project promote growth patterns resulting in the need for and/or provision of new or physically altered police protection facilities in order to maintain service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives and the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts?</p>	<p><u>Housing strategies 1 (RM), 2 (BYO), 3 (MMUP), and the SMUP Alternative would not result in any need to construct new facilities. Therefore, there would be no inherent differences in impacts among the housing strategies.</u></p> <p>No new or expanded police facilities are required in conjunction with the HEU. General Plan conformance would assure that future projects maintain adequate levels of service are available in conjunction with future development. At this programmatic level, impacts would be less than significant <u>for housing strategies 1-3 and the SMUP Alternative.</u></p>	<p>Impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.</p>	<p><u>Housing Strategy 1 (RM) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 2 (BYO) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 3- (MMUP) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>SMUP Alternative – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Less than Significant</u></p>

**Table S-1
Summary of Significant Environmental Analysis Results – HEU Housing Strategies 1-3 and the SMUP Alternative**

Environmental Issue	Results of Impact Analysis	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
<p>Issue 1c: Schools</p> <p>Would the project promote growth patterns resulting in the need for and/or provision of new or physically altered school facilities in order to maintain service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives and the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts?</p>	<p><u>Housing strategies 1 (RM), 2 (BYO), 3 (MMUP), and the SMUP Alternative would not result in any need to construct new facilities. Although the number of students generated under each strategy may differ, there would be no inherent differences in impacts among the housing strategies.</u></p> <p>No new or expanded school facilities are required in conjunction with adoption of the HEU. With payment of statutory fees, school impacts would be less than significant <u>for housing strategies 1-3 and the SMUP Alternative.</u></p>	<p>Impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.</p>	<p><u>Housing Strategy 1 (RM) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 2 (BYO) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 3- (MMUP) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>SMUP Alternative – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Less than Significant</u></p>
<p>Issue 1d: Library Services</p> <p>Would the project promote growth patterns resulting in the need for and/or provision of new or physically altered library facilities in order to maintain service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives and the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts?</p>	<p><u>Housing strategies 1 (RM), 2 (BYO), 3 (MMUP), and the SMUP Alternative would not result in any need to construct new facilities. Therefore, there would be no inherent differences in impacts among the housing strategies.</u></p> <p>No new or expansion of library facilities are required in conjunction with adoption of the HEU. Impacts would be less than significant <u>for housing strategies 1-3 and the SMUP Alternative.</u></p>	<p>Impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.</p>	<p><u>Housing Strategy 1 (RM) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 2 (BYO) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 3- (MMUP) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>SMUP Alternative – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Less than Significant</u></p>

**Table S-1
Summary of Significant Environmental Analysis Results – HEU Housing Strategies 1-3 and the SMUP Alternative**

Environmental Issue	Results of Impact Analysis	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
<p>Issues 2 and 3: Recreation</p> <p>Would the project have a substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of, or the need for, new or physically altered park and recreation facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives associated with recreation?</p>	<p><u>Housing strategies 1 (RM), 2 (BYO), 3 (MMUP), and the SMUP Alternative would not result in any need to construct new facilities. Therefore, there would be no inherent differences in impacts among the housing strategies.</u></p> <p>No new or expansion of park/recreation facilities are required in conjunction with adoption of the HEU. Impacts would be less than significant <u>for housing strategies 1-3 and the SMUP Alternative.</u></p>	<p>Impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.</p>	<p><u>Housing Strategy 1 (RM) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 2 (BYO) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 3- (MMUP) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>SMUP Alternative – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Less than Significant</u></p>

**Table S-1
Summary of Significant Environmental Analysis Results – HEU Housing Strategies 1-3 and the SMUP Alternative**

Environmental Issue	Results of Impact Analysis	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
Transportation and Traffic			
<p>Issues 1 and 2: Circulation System Capacity and Operations</p> <p>Would the project result in buildout of land uses, which would generate an increase in projected traffic that is substantial in relation to the capacity of the existing circulation system (with the addition of funded CIP improvements)?</p> <p>Would the project conflict with other standards establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?</p>	<p>a. Housing Strategy 1 (RM) Housing strategy 1 would result in 15 significant roadway segment impacts. As indicated in Table 4.13-20, these impacts are identified as Impacts TRF-1 to TRF-15. Impacts to freeway segments would be less than significant.</p> <p>b. Housing Strategy 2 (BYO) Housing strategy 2 would result in 20 significant roadway segment impacts. As indicated in Table 4.13-20, these impacts are identified as Impacts TRF-1, TRF-4 to TRF-12, and TRF-14 to TRF-21. Impacts to freeway segments would be less than significant.</p> <p>c. Housing Strategy 3 (MMUP) Housing strategy 3 would result in 20 significant roadway segment impacts. As indicated in Table 4.13-20, these impacts are identified as Impacts TRF-1 to TRF-20. Impacts to freeway segments would be less than significant. Housing strategy 3 (MMUP) would have two significant intersection impacts (TRF-22 and TRF-23), as well as three ramp intersection impacts (TRF-24 to TRF-26).</p> <p>SMUP Alternative - The SMUP Alternative would result in 6 significant roadway segment impacts (TRF-4, TRF-5, TRF-6, TRF-7, TRF-9, TRF-10), two intersection impacts (TRF-22 and TRF-23), and one ramp intersection impact (TRF-26).</p> <p><u>Overall, buildout of the HEU would result in significant impacts (Impacts TRF-1 through TRF-26) to roadway segments for all three housing strategies, SMUP Alternative, and intersections (as demonstrated by intersection analysis for Housing Strategy 3 (MMUP)). These are cumulative impacts of the HEU buildout that would potentially occur when buildout of the HEU is added to future growth in the surrounding area for the horizon year 2035. Therefore, impacts to circulation system capacity and operations would be potentially significant, and require mitigation.</u></p>	<p>As demonstrated in the traffic analysis above, buildout of the HEU would result in significant impacts (Impacts TRF-1 through TRF-26) to roadway segments (all three strategies and intersections (as demonstrated by intersection analysis for Housing Strategy 3 (MMUP)). These are cumulative impacts of the HEU buildout that would potentially occur when buildout of the HEU is added to future growth in the surrounding area for the horizon year 2035. To reduce the potentially significant impacts, improvements to roadway segments and intersections would be required. Table 4.13-21 identifies the measures (TRF-1 through TRF-26) that would be required for each impacted roadway/intersection to establish a program for funding improvements needed to address traffic impacts of the HEU. This program requires actions to be taken by both the City (establishment and implementation) as well as future projects.</p> <p>The City already has a city-wide capital improvement program in place to address traffic improvements needed for future buildout under the adopted General Plan. Since the HEU would result in additional impacts beyond buildout of the General Plan, a program development consistent with the HEU floating new zone program is required to fund improvements described in Table 4.13-21. Such a program would be applied as future projects are processed. Mitigation measure TRF-27 is designed to establish a program for funding improvements needed to address traffic impacts of the HEU. This program requires actions to be taken by both the City (establishment and implementation) as well as future projects. General Plan, a program specifically related to the future</p> <p>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 floating zone HEU fee mitigation program, as follows:</p> <p>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.</p>	<p><u>Housing Strategy 1 (RM) – Significant and Unavoidable</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 2 (BYO) – Significant and Unavoidable</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 3 (MMUP) – Significant and Unavoidable</u></p> <p><u>SMUP Alternative – Significant and Unavoidable</u></p> <p><u>Significant and Unavoidable</u></p>

**Table S-1
Summary of Significant Environmental Analysis Results – HEU Housing Strategies 1-3 and the SMUP Alternative**

Environmental Issue	Results of Impact Analysis	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
		<p>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.</p> <p>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. <u>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.</u></p> <p>d. The City shall complete an annual public report on the HEU traffic mitigation program within 180 days of the completion of the fiscal year pursuant to the Mitigation Fee Act (California Government Code Section 66000 et seq.).</p> <p>TRF-28: <u>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.</u></p> <p>As identified in TRF 27, this 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.”</p>	

**Table S-1
Summary of Significant Environmental Analysis Results – HEU Housing Strategies 1-3 and the SMUP Alternative**

Environmental Issue	Results of Impact Analysis	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
		<p><u>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.</u></p> <p><u>As identified in TRF-27 and TRF-28, this mitigation framework 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."</u></p>	

**Table S-1
Summary of Significant Environmental Analysis Results – HEU Housing Strategies 1-3 and the SMUP Alternative**

Environmental Issue	Results of Impact Analysis	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
<p>Issue 3: Alternative Transportation Modes</p> <p>Would the project conflict with the City’s adopted General or Specific Plan policies supporting alternative transportation modes (e.g., bus turnouts, trolley extensions, bicycle lanes, bicycle racks, etc.)?</p>	<p><u>As indicated in EIR Section 3.2.2, transit access was specifically considered as a criterion in the identification of housing sites. Most housing sites also were selected based on their proximity to transit and other alternative transportation (refer to EIR Section 3.2.2.3 and Appendix N). Overall, there would be no inherent differences in impacts among the housing strategies, as future development under each strategy would comply with the same alternative transportation policies.</u></p> <p>The future development allowed under the HEU floating-new zone program would be subject to the General Plan goals and policies regarding alternative transportation. Additionally, the Design Guidelines encourage access and connectivity be considered in the design of future projects.- Thus, the HEU would not result in a conflict with the City’s adopted General Plan supporting alternative transportation modes. <u>-Impacts resulting from all three housing strategies and the SMUP Alternative would be less than significant.</u>Impacts would be less than significant.</p>	<p>Impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.</p>	<p><u>Housing Strategy 1 (RM) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 2 (BYO) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 3- (MMUP) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>SMUP Alternative – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Less than Significant</u></p>
<p>Issues 4 and 5: Traffic Hazards and Emergency Access</p> <p>Would the project result in an increase in traffic hazards for motor vehicles, bicyclists, or pedestrians?</p> <p>Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?</p>	<p><u>Future development consistent with the HEU would be required to be in accordance with the General Plan goals and policies, including these goals and policies related to traffic safety; therefore, there would be no inherent differences in impacts among the housing strategies or the SMUP Alternative.</u></p> <p>Adherence to the City’s roadway design standards, City Municipal Code and California Fire Code emergency access requirements, as well as the City General Plan Goals and policies related to traffic would avoid or reduce potentially significant traffic hazard or emergency access impacts to below a level of significance. <u>Therefore, impacts resulting from all three housing strategies and the SMUP Alternative would be less than significant.</u></p>	<p>Impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.</p>	<p><u>Housing Strategy 1 (RM) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 2 (BYO) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 3- (MMUP) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>SMUP Alternative – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Less than Significant</u></p>

**Table S-1
Summary of Significant Environmental Analysis Results – HEU Housing Strategies 1-3 and the SMUP Alternative**

Environmental Issue	Results of Impact Analysis	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
Public Utilities			
<p>Issue 1a: Storm Water System</p> <p>Would the project result in a need for new systems, or require substantial alterations to existing storm water infrastructure, the construction of which would create physical impacts?</p>	<p><u>Adoption of housing strategy 1 – Ready Made (RM), housing strategy 2 – Build Your Own (BYO), housing strategy 3 - Modified Mixed Use Places (MMUP), or the SMUP Alternative would not result in any need to construct new storm water facilities.</u></p> <p>Since there is adequate capacity in the storm water system and future projects are required to assure that storm water is adequately handled on-site, no construction or expansion of storm water facilities is required in conjunction with the HEU. Impacts to the City’s storm water system would be less than significant <u>at the program-level for the three housing strategies and the SMUP Alternative.</u></p>	<p>Impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.</p>	<p><u>Housing Strategy 1 (RM) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 2 (BYO) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 3- (MMUP) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>SMUP Alternative – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Less than Significant</u></p>
<p>Issue 1b and 3: Wastewater</p> <p>Would the project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Result in a need for new systems, or require substantial alterations to existing utilities, including wastewater, or reclaimed water infrastructure, the construction of which would create physical impacts? Result in a demand for wastewater treatment such that local wastewater treatment provider(s) have inadequate capacity to serve project buildout in addition to the provider’s existing commitments and new or expanded facilities are needed? 	<p><u>Adoption of housing strategy 1 – Ready Made (RM), housing strategy 2 – Build Your Own (BYO), housing strategy 3 - Modified Mixed Use Places (MMUP), or the SMUP Alternative would not result in any need to construct new facilities.</u></p> <p>Sewer master planning is in place to assure adequate facilities would be available to serve new development and, no construction or expansion of storm water facilities is required in conjunction with the HEU. Impacts to the City’s wastewater system would therefore be less than significant at the program-level <u>for the three housing strategies and the SMUP Alternative.</u></p>	<p>Impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.</p>	<p><u>Housing Strategy 1 (RM) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 2 (BYO) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 3- (MMUP) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>SMUP Alternative – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Less than Significant</u></p>

**Table S-1
Summary of Significant Environmental Analysis Results – HEU Housing Strategies 1-3 and the SMUP Alternative**

Environmental Issue	Results of Impact Analysis	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
<p>Issue 1c: Water System</p> <p>Would the project require or result in the construction of new water facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</p>	<p><u>Adoption of housing strategy 1 – Ready Made (RM), housing strategy 2 – Build Your Own (BYO), housing strategy 3 - Modified Mixed Use Places (MMUP), or the SMUP Alternative would not result in any need to construct new facilities.</u></p> <p>Water master planning is in place to assure adequate facilities would be available to serve new development and, no construction or expansion of water facilities is required in conjunction with the HEU. Impacts to the City’s water system would therefore be less than significant at the program-level <u>for the three housing strategies and the SMUP Alternative.</u></p>	<p>Impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.</p>	<p><u>Housing Strategy 1 (RM) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 2 (BYO) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 3- (MMUP) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>SMUP Alternative – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Less than Significant</u></p>
<p>Issue 2: Water Supply</p> <p>Would the project require or result in the need for new water supply entitlements and resources?</p>	<p><u>Adoption of housing strategy 1 – Ready Made (RM), housing strategy 2 – Build Your Own (BYO), housing strategy 3 - Modified Mixed Use Places (MMUP), or the SMUP Alternative would not result in any need to construct new facilities.</u></p> <p>Plans for water supply are in place to assure adequate facilities would be available to serve new development and, no construction or expansion of water supply facilities is required in conjunction with adoption of the HEU. Impacts to the City’s water supply would therefore be less than significant at the program-level <u>for the three housing strategies and the SMUP Alternative.</u></p>	<p>Impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.</p>	<p><u>Housing Strategy 1 (RM) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 2 (BYO) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 3- (MMUP) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>SMUP Alternative – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Less than Significant</u></p>

**Table S-1
Summary of Significant Environmental Analysis Results – HEU Housing Strategies 1-3 and the SMUP Alternative**

Environmental Issue	Results of Impact Analysis	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
<p>Issue 4: Solid Waste Disposal</p> <p>Would the project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Be served by a landfill without sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s waste disposal needs; or • Not comply with the federal, state, and local statutes and regulations regarding solid waste? 	<p><u>Adoption of housing strategy 1 – Ready Made (RM), housing strategy 2 – Build Your Own (BYO), housing strategy 3 - Modified Mixed Use Places (MMUP), or the SMUP Alternative would not result in any need to construct new facilities.</u></p> <p>Solid waste and landfill planning is in place to assure adequate facilities would be available to serve new development and, no construction or expansion of landfill facilities is required in conjunction with adoption of the HEU. Impacts to the City’s solid waste disposal would therefore be less than significant at the program-level <u>for the three housing strategies and the SMUP Alternative.</u></p>	<p>Impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.</p>	<p><u>Housing Strategy 1 (RM) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 2 (BYO) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Housing Strategy 3- (MMUP) – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>SMUP Alternative – Less than Significant</u></p> <p><u>Less than Significant</u></p>