

# OCEANSIDE COAST HIGHWAY CORRIDOR STUDY

## Environmental Impact Report

Prepared for  
City of Oceanside

April 2019





# OCEANSIDE COAST HIGHWAY CORRIDOR STUDY

## Environmental Impact Report

Prepared for  
City of Oceanside

April 2019

550 West C Street  
Suite 750  
San Diego, CA 92101  
619.719.4200  
[www.esassoc.com](http://www.esassoc.com)



Bend	Oakland	San Francisco
Camarillo	Orlando	Santa Monica
Delray Beach	Pasadena	Sarasota
Destin	Petaluma	Seattle
Irvine	Portland	Sunrise
Los Angeles	Sacramento	Tampa
Miami	San Diego	

D130217.00

**OUR COMMITMENT TO SUSTAINABILITY** | ESA helps a variety of public and private sector clients plan and prepare for climate change and emerging regulations that limit GHG emissions. ESA is a registered assessor with the California Climate Action Registry, a Climate Leader, and founding reporter for the Climate Registry. ESA is also a corporate member of the U.S. Green Building Council and the Business Council on Climate Change (BC3). Internally, ESA has adopted a Sustainability Vision and Policy Statement and a plan to reduce waste and energy within our operations. This document was produced using recycled paper.

# SUMMARY

---

## S.1 Introduction

This summary provides an overview of the Coast Highway Corridor Study Environmental Impact Report (EIR) as required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code, Section 21000 et seq. and California Code of Regulations Title 14 Section 15000 et seq. [CEQA Guidelines]). This EIR is an informational document prepared by the lead agency that must be considered by decision makers before approving or denying a proposed project. The City of Oceanside (City) is the lead agency for this project.

This EIR has been prepared to evaluate the environmental impacts associated with implementation of the proposed Coast Highway Corridor Study Project (proposed project, or project). This EIR is an informational document intended for use by the City of Oceanside, other public agencies, and members of the general public in evaluating the potential environmental effects of the proposed project.

This EIR has been prepared in compliance with requirements of CEQA to address any potential environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the project. The project consists of two components, the Complete Streets improvements and the Coast Highway Incentive District.

CEQA Statute Section 21002 requires that an EIR identify the significant effects of a project on the environment and provide measures or alternatives that can mitigate or avoid these effects. This EIR evaluates the environmental effects associated with the project and discusses the manner in which the project's significant effects can be reduced or avoided through mitigation measures or feasible alternatives to the proposed project. In accordance with Section 15130 of the CEQA Guidelines, this EIR also includes an examination of the effects of cumulative development. Cumulative impacts occur when the combined effects of several projects may be significant when considered collectively.

This summary provides a brief synopsis of: the proposed project, results of the environmental analysis contained within this environmental document, alternatives to the proposed project that were considered, and major areas of controversy and issues to be resolved by decision makers.

This summary does not contain the extensive background and analysis found throughout the individual chapters within the EIR. Therefore, the reader should review the entire document to fully understand the project and its environmental effects.

## S.2 Summary of the Proposed Project

The proposed project consists of two components, the Complete Streets improvements and the Coast Highway Incentive District (herein referred to as the Incentive District). The Complete Streets improvements include proposed modifications to the Coast Highway corridor and roadway, such as lane conversions, street improvements, intersection roundabouts, and increased parking, pedestrian, transit, and bicycle facilities.

The Incentive District is an amendment to the Zoning Ordinance. Incentive Districts are imposed over existing zoning designations and contain provisions that are applicable in addition to those contained in the existing zoning designations. If adopted, the Incentive District would be an optional zoning program that individual developers could use to apply for new development or redevelopment within the Incentive District boundary in lieu of the existing zoning. The Incentive District would facilitate implementation of the Coast Highway Vision and Strategic Plan (Vision Plan) by encouraging redevelopment and revitalization of the Coast Highway corridor. Implementation of the Incentive District would require amendments to the General Plan, Local Coastal Program (LCP), and Zoning Ordinance.

### Project Location

The proposed project is located within the city of Oceanside, California, in northern San Diego County. The project area includes both the Complete Streets improvements, including proposed intersection roundabouts, within the Coast Highway corridor and the Incentive District boundaries. The portion of Coast Highway that includes the Complete Streets improvements spans approximately 3.5 miles from the northern terminus of Coast Highway at Harbor Drive to Eaton Street near the city's southern boundary. The Incentive District boundaries are irregular in shape and extend from Seagaze Drive to the north past Eaton Street to the south. Generally, Ditmar Street and Pacific Street span the east and west boundaries. The Pacific Ocean coastline is located less than one-half mile to the west of Coast Highway.

### Project Objectives

The City of Oceanside has defined the following goals and objectives of the proposed project:

**Goal 1:** Transform Coast Highway into a “Complete Streets” that accommodates all roadway users (pedestrians, bicyclists, and automobiles)

**Objectives:**

- Improve the pedestrian environment
- Provide a continuous striped bicycle lane
- Improve traffic flow and implement traffic calming measures to reduce traffic intrusion to adjacent neighborhoods
- Provide access to and facilitate the use of transit facilities

**Goal 2:** Improve safety for all roadway users

**Objectives:**

- Slow traffic speeds and improve traffic flow
- Implement roundabouts in place of traffic signals where feasible to reduce auto and pedestrian conflicts at intersections
- Add new, mid-block pedestrian crossing opportunities between major intersections to facilitate pedestrian crossing of the roadway

**Goal 3:** Facilitate implementation of the Coast Highway Vision and Strategic Plan**Objectives:**

- Encourage redevelopment and continued investment within the Incentive District by providing development incentives in exchange for community benefits to enhance and revitalize the project area
- Increase on-street parking supply corridor-wide to support new land uses
- Foster a built environment along Coast Highway that includes:
  - Streets and spaces that are pedestrian-scale and pleasurable to walk within
  - Architecture that announces gateways, key intersections, and public spaces
  - A consistent street frontage throughout the nodes
  - Building architecture that is high quality and provides variation and diversity

## Description of the Complete Streets Improvements

The 3.5-mile stretch of Coast Highway currently operates with four travel lanes, two northbound and two southbound, with limited on-street parking and no designated bicycle facilities. Implementation of the proposed project would improve infrastructure for all modes of transportation, including bicycle, pedestrian, and transit services, while also accommodating forecast future traffic volumes within the corridor. Specifically, the Complete Streets improvements would convert Coast Highway from four lanes to two lanes (one travel lane in each direction) for the length of the corridor, with segments of two southbound travel lanes between State Route (SR) 76 and Surfrider Way, and south of Kelly Street to Eaton Street. Further, key elements of the Complete Streets improvements include a continuous Class II striped bicycle lane from Harbor Drive to the southern city limit, 10 mid-block crosswalks to facilitate safe and convenient pedestrian crossings of the corridor, 12 roundabouts in place of traffic signals where physically feasible and where the intersection traffic volumes support implementation, traffic-calming measures, and streetscape enhancements, such as removing dead trees and replanting trees. These enhancements to the landscaping and roadway would help implement the vision of the corridor established within the Vision Plan.

The Coast Highway corridor is divided into five major segments for purposes of describing the Complete Streets improvements, as follows:

- Segment 1: Harbor Drive to SR 76
- Segment 2: SR 76 to Wisconsin Avenue
- Segment 3: Wisconsin Avenue to Oceanside Boulevard
- Segment 4: Oceanside Boulevard to Morse Street
- Segment 5: Morse Street to Eaton Street

Within each of the five major segments, there may be minor differences on a block-by-block basis to accommodate variations in roadway configurations designed to provide appropriate traffic turning lanes, parking, and/or bicycle facilities. Chapter 2, Project Description, provides more detail on the improvements proposed for each of the segments.

## Description of the Coast Highway Incentive District

In addition to the Complete Streets improvements, the proposed project also includes an amendment to the City's Zoning Ordinance to create a Coast Highway Incentive District (the Incentive District) (refer to Figure 2-2, Project Area and Vicinity). The Incentive District would provide optional regulations and standards that a developer or property owner may choose in lieu of the existing zoning. If adopted, the Incentive District would be an optional zoning program that individual developers could use to apply for new development or redevelopment within the Incentive District boundary. However, if a developer or property owner does not choose to adhere to the Incentive District, then future development may still occur solely consistent with the existing zoning. Implementation of the Incentive District would require amendments to the City's General Plan, LCP, and Zoning Ordinance.

The City prepared the Coast Highway Vision and Strategic Plan (Vision Plan) and the City Council voted to accept the Vision Plan in 2009 to serve as an advisory document to help guide future development within the Coast Highway corridor. The concept of the Incentive District was inspired by the Vision Plan, which served as a guidance document along with the City's General Plan during the development of the Incentive District.

The primary purpose of the Incentive District is to encourage redevelopment and revitalization of the Coast Highway corridor through land use regulations, design and development criteria, and development incentives that will encourage sustainable, high-quality development. Consistent with the overall ideas within the Vision Plan, the Incentive District would establish regulations intended to:

1. Incent redevelopment and revitalization of the Incentive District by streamlining the development review process and providing development incentives.
2. Encourage sustainable, high-quality development consistent with the intent and objectives articulated in the Coast Highway Vision and Strategic Plan.
3. Create distinct pedestrian-oriented subareas, including:
  - a) Urbane mixed-use nodal areas featuring relatively intense commercial land use and residential density; development in these nodal areas will generally be taller and more

- street-adjacent than development in other subareas; commercial uses, including visitor-serving businesses, will provide a wide range of employment opportunities.
- b) Commercial Villages featuring neighborhood-serving commercial uses in a suburban main street setting; these villages also allow for mixed-use development, consistent with underlying zoning standards.
  - c) Transitional Avenue segments featuring a combination of mixed-use, standalone commercial, and standalone residential development with generally less land use intensity and residential density relative to nodal areas; providing for auto-related uses, these segments are characterized by more expansive setbacks and landscaping.
4. Promote high-quality urban and architectural design and variability of massing and height, emphasizing the design of the interface between the private and public realms.
  5. Facilitate the creation of vibrant community places and tourist destinations.
  6. Treat Coast Highway as a complete, multi-modal street that is safe, pedestrian and bicycle friendly, accessible, attractive, visually and functionally engaging for users of all ages and abilities, and well integrated with adjoining neighborhoods along the corridor.

The Incentive District incents development and redevelopment by offering a streamlined development review process, expanding the land uses permitted by right, reforming parking standards, and allowing increased height of buildings in certain planning areas, with discretionary approval. In addition, the Incentive District includes a Residential Density Bonus Program that allows for increased residential density for nodal development in exchange for public benefits. These benefits include providing one or more of the following: additional open space, public parking, additional commercial floor area, and payment to a Public Improvement Fee. Further, the Incentive District would provide form-based design and development standards to achieve the pedestrian-scale and architectural variation of buildings advocated in the Vision Plan.

The Incentive District also seeks to create a better balance of land uses in recognition of the market potential and the desire of the City to promote an increase of residential, office, hotel, and retail/restaurant uses. Chapter 2, Project Description, summarizes additional development from existing conditions that is expected to occur with implementation of the Incentive District through the year 2035. The new development anticipated under the Incentive District would be consistent with the growth and development potential under the City's General Plan land use regulations and could occur under current conditions. However, it is expected that implementation of the Incentive District development might encourage growth and/or new land uses that could occur more quickly than under current conditions.

### **S.3 Summary of Project Alternatives**

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines, EIRs are required to “describe 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 evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives” (14 California Code of Regulations (CCR) 15126.6(a)). This EIR “must consider a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that will foster informed decision making and public participation”

(14 CCR 15126.6(a)). The alternatives discussion is required even if these alternatives “would impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives, or would be more costly” (14 CCR 15126.6(b)).

The following provides a summary of each of the alternatives that are considered in this EIR. For a full discussion of the alternatives and an evaluation of their potential environmental effects, refer to Chapter 5, Alternatives to the Proposed Project.

### ***No Project Alternative***

Under the No Project Alternative, the project area would remain as it is under existing conditions. Coast Highway would consist of four travel lanes, and the Incentive District would not be established. In addition, under the No Project Alternative, no roundabouts, mid-block crosswalks, raised medians, continuous bicycle lanes, or enhanced streetscaping would be provided. The amount of public parking would remain the same as existing conditions. Instead of allowing the use of the optional Incentive District development regulations and guidelines, the project area would continue to be developed and/or redeveloped using the existing land use designations from the City’s General Plan and the existing Zoning Ordinance. As directed by Section 15126.6(a)(3)(A) of the CEQA Guidelines, when a project is the revision of an existing land use or regulatory plan, policy or ongoing operation, the No Project Alternative will be the continuation of the existing plan, policy, or operation into the future. Thus, impacts that would be reasonably anticipated to occur with development under the existing Zoning Ordinance and General Plan are compared to the anticipated impacts of development under the proposed Incentive District (as identified in Chapter 3 of this EIR).

### ***Alternative 1 – Four Lanes between Oceanside Boulevard and Vista Way + Incentive District***

Under this alternative, the Complete Streets improvements would be modified to extend only from Harbor Drive to Oceanside Boulevard. The modified Complete Streets improvements would convert Coast Highway from four travel lanes to two travel lanes, ergo, one lane of travel in each direction. Coast Highway would transition back to four travel lanes from Oceanside Boulevard to the southern boundary of the city. A median would divide the two travel lanes and seven roundabouts would be constructed at the following intersections:

- Coast Highway & SR 76
- Coast Highway & Civic Center Drive
- Coast Highway & Pier View Way
- Coast Highway & Washington Avenue
- Coast Highway & Wisconsin Avenue
- Coast Highway & Michigan Avenue
- Coast Highway & West Street

In addition to the seven roundabouts, Alternative 1 would provide Class II striped bicycle lanes from Oceanside Boulevard to Morse Street, Class III sharrow markings on Coast Highway between Morse Street and Vista Way, and curb-extending mid-block pedestrian crosswalks at Whaley Street and Kelly Street. As in existing conditions, on-street parking

would remain on Coast Highway between Oceanside Boulevard and Vista Way and signalized intersections would be maintained at Surfrider Way, Oceanside Boulevard, Morse Street, and Cassidy Street. Alternative 1 would also provide streetscaping improvements along Coast Highway from Oceanside Boulevard to Vista Way, which include sidewalk enhancements and parkway landscaping. Additionally, under this alternative, all other components associated with the Incentive District would remain the same as the proposed project.

### ***Alternative 2 – Four Lanes between Morse Street and Vista Way + Incentive District***

Under this alternative, the Complete Streets improvements would be modified to extend from Harbor Drive to Morse Street, a shorter length than the improvements included in the proposed project. The modified Complete Streets improvements would convert Coast Highway from four travel lanes to two travel lanes with one lane of travel in each direction. Coast Highway would transition back to four travel lanes from Morse Street to the southern boundary of the city. A median would divide the two travel lanes and seven roundabouts would be constructed at the same intersections as in Alternative 1.

In addition to the seven roundabouts, Alternative 2 would provide Class III sharrow markings on Coast Highway between Morse Street and Vista Way and curb-extending mid-block pedestrian crosswalks at Whaley Street and Kelly Street. As under existing conditions, on-street parking would remain on Coast Highway between Morse Street and Vista Way and signalized intersections would be maintained at Surfrider Way, Oceanside Boulevard, Morse Street, and Cassidy Street. Alternative 2 would also provide streetscaping improvements along Coast Highway from Morse Street to Vista Way, which include sidewalk enhancements and parkway landscaping. Additionally, under this alternative, all other components associated with the Incentive District would remain the same as the proposed project.

### ***Alternative 3 – Complete Streets Improvements and Incentive District to Morse Street and Existing Conditions between Morse Street to Vista Way***

Under this alternative, both the Complete Streets improvements and the Incentive District would be modified to extend from Harbor Drive to Morse Street, which would reduce the project footprint compared to the proposed project. The modified Complete Streets improvements would convert Coast Highway from four travel lanes to two travel lanes with one lane of travel in each direction from Harbor Drive to Morse Street. Coast Highway would transition back to four travel lanes from Morse Street to the southern boundary of the city (refer to Figure 5-7). A median would divide the two travel lanes and seven roundabouts would be constructed at the following intersections<sup>1</sup>:

---

<sup>1</sup> Numbering refers to the intersection reference numbering found in Section 3.14.

- Coast Highway & SR 76
- Coast Highway & Civic Center Drive
- Coast Highway & Pier View Way
- Coast Highway & Washington Avenue
- Coast Highway & Wisconsin Avenue
- Coast Highway & Michigan Avenue
- Coast Highway & West Street

In addition to the seven roundabouts, Alternative 3 would provide Class III sharrow markings on Coast Highway between Morse Street and Vista Way and curb-extending mid-block pedestrian crosswalks at Whaley Street and Kelly Street. As under existing conditions, on-street parking would remain on Coast Highway between Morse Street and Vista Way, and signalized intersections would be maintained at Surfrider Way, Oceanside Boulevard, Morse Street, and Cassidy Street. Alternative 3 would also provide streetscaping improvements along Coast Highway from Morse Street to Vista Way, which include sidewalk enhancements and parkway landscaping.

Alternative 3 would also limit the boundaries of the Incentive District, where the optional zoning program would not apply to properties south of Morse Street. Unlike Alternative 1 and 2, Alternative 3 would differ from the proposed project in the boundaries of the Incentive District.

#### ***Alternative 4 – Complete Streets Improvements Only, No Incentive District***

Under this alternative, only the Complete Streets improvement component of the proposed project would be implemented. This alternative would still convert Coast Highway from four lanes to two lanes (one travel lane in each direction) for the length of the corridor, with segments of two southbound travel lanes between State Route (SR) 76 and Surfrider Way, and south of Kelly Street to Vista Way. Other key elements of the Complete Streets improvements include a continuous Class II striped bicycle lane from Harbor Drive to the southern city limit, 10 mid-block crosswalks to facilitate safe and convenient pedestrian crossings of the corridor, 12 roundabouts in place of traffic signals where physically feasible and where the intersection traffic volumes support implementation, raised medians, traffic-calming measures, and streetscape enhancements such as removing dead trees and replanting trees. The Incentive District would not be established under this alternative. Growth would occur in the project area similar to current trends under existing land use regulations. Similar effects to the development and redevelopment enabled under the Incentive District could occur in the project area under existing growth regulations, but possibly not as quickly as with implementation of the Incentive District.

While the majority of this EIR focuses on the option of converting Coast Highway from four lanes to two lanes (one travel lane in each direction) for the 3.5-mile length of the Coast Highway corridor, the City could also opt to adopt an alternative that narrows the extent of the improvements— Alternative 1, Alternative 2, or Alternative 3. Alternative 1 would retain four lanes south of Oceanside Boulevard, while Alternatives 2 and 3 would

retain four lanes south of Morse Street. Refer to Chapter 5 for further consideration of these alternatives.

A thorough analysis of the traffic and circulation implications of implementation of Alternatives 1 through 3 has been conducted, which is provided in the TIA (Appendix G of this EIR) and is summarized in Chapter 5. Other than traffic and circulation, Alternatives 1 and 2 would result in similar impacts as the proposed project. Given the traffic and circulation implications of Alternatives 1 and 2 have been addressed at an equal level of detail in the technical analyses contained in this EIR, the City could opt to adopt one of these two alternatives using the analysis contained in this EIR. In addition, the City could opt to adopt Alternative 3, which would narrow both the Complete Streets improvements and the Incentive District to Morse Street and retain existing conditions south of Morse Street as a means to focus the project to the northern half of the Coast Highway corridor. Section S-7 includes additional information on the mitigation measures that would be required with adoption of Alternative 1 through Alternative 3.

As discussed in greater detail in Chapter 5, Alternatives, based on the consideration of the full range and type of impacts caused by the proposed project and the alternatives, Alternative 3 is identified as the environmentally superior alternative. Alternative 3 would limit both the Complete Streets improvements and the Incentive District to Morse Street. When compared to the proposed project, Alternative 3 would reduce significant traffic impacts under the Future Conditions + Alternative 3 scenario, as this alternative would result in significant impacts at 5 intersections, compared to 10 intersections with the proposed project. Alternative 3 would result in significant and unavoidable impacts at three intersections compared to significant and unavoidable impacts at four intersections under the proposed project. In addition, by limiting the southern boundary of the Incentive District under Alternative 3, which results in a negligible difference in environmental impacts compared to the proposed project, this alternative appeases residents in south Oceanside who expressed their preference to be excluded from the proposed project. While the difference in environmental impacts is minimal, this alternative could be more attractive than the project to the City's decision makers based on the public input received during the CEQA environmental documentation process.

Finally, Alternative 3 is not significantly different than the project from an environmental perspective when considering other environmental resources areas. Most other environmental impacts of the proposed project would either be less than significant without mitigation or adequately addressed through fairly simple mitigation measures. The exception to this is the significant unavoidable impacts related to noise, where Alternative 3 would result in an additional roadway segment experiencing a significant and unavoidable impact related to a permanent increase in noise level than the proposed project. However, a significant unavoidable noise impact related to a permanent increase in noise level would occur regardless of implementation of the project or Alternative 3. Unlike the significant traffic impacts associated with the proposed project, Alternative 3 could not be redesigned to reduce the significant and unavoidable impacts related to a temporary increase in ambient noise levels, a permanent increase in noise levels along the roadway segment of Michigan Avenue, and the cumulative noise impact along Wisconsin Avenue between Freeman Street and Ditmar Street, and Washington Avenue west of Coast

Highway. These significant and unavoidable impacts remain with implementation of Alternative 3 due to the reconfiguration of Coast Highway at these three intersections similar to the proposed project and the configuration of existing land uses in this area, which make standard noise reduction measures, such as sound walls, infeasible in these locations. Therefore, while Alternative 3 would result in significant and unavoidable impacts related to noise, overall Alternative 3 would reduce significant impacts to all environmental topics compared to the proposed project.

Thus, because Alternative 3 meet the project objectives and would reduce overall significant environmental impacts identified by the project, Alternative 3 is considered the environmentally superior project alternative.

## **S.4 Summary of Known Controversial Issues**

CEQA Guidelines require that the summary of an EIR include a synopsis of known issues of controversy that have been raised by agencies and the public (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15123). On June 1, 2016, the City published a Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the EIR and circulated it to governmental agencies, organizations, and persons who may be interested in the proposed project, including nearby landowners, homeowners, and tenants. The comment period extended through July 1, 2016. In addition, on June 23, 2016, the City held an agency and public scoping meeting. A summary of the comments is included in Appendix A.

Areas of controversy have been identified for the proposed project based on comments made during the 30-day public review period in response to information published in the NOP. Nineteen comment letters were received during the NOP scoping period. While some of the comment letters raised issues for analysis in the EIR, many of the comment letters received also provided preferences or opinion on whether or not elements of the project should be implemented. The following is a summary of the known issues that were received during the NOP comment period:

- Numerous people expressed that they were not supportive of possible roundabouts and cited concerns regarding safety, traffic bottlenecks, and accessibility to businesses.
- There was mixed opinion on whether the City should leave Coast Highway with four travel lanes versus the two proposed by the project.
- Emergency access and fire department response times were raised as concerns that should be addressed in the EIR.
- There was concern that, by limiting the accessibility of Coast Highway, traffic might be diverted to side streets and that the adjacent neighborhoods would be negatively affected by the changes, including loss of parking.
- Many stated that the amount of parking provided with the proposed project should not be less than is currently provided. If there would be less parking provided, many were concerned about the economic impact that would result to the businesses along Coast Highway.

- Concern was raised about bicycle and pedestrian safety and ensuring that the improvements proposed for Coast Highway would address conflicts between these automobile and non-motorized travel modes. Several commenters expressed that the traffic speeds are currently too high along Coast Highway and that traffic should be slowed down.
- A few commenters opined that residential development should not be allowed on Coast Highway and that Coast Highway should remain for commercial uses.
- Several commenters raised concerns about greenhouse gases (GHGs), air emissions, and the health impacts of pedestrians and bicyclists at intersections and along the transportation corridor.
- The Pechanga Tribe, Pala Tribal Historic Preservation Office, the Rincon Band of Luiseno Indians, and the San Luis Rey Band of Mission Indians all wrote comment letters expressing interest in the project, voiced concern about archeological and tribal resources, and/or requested consultation pursuant to Assembly Bill 52.

## S.5 Issues to Be Resolved

In consideration of the project, the City will need to weigh public opinion, transportation issues, the benefits of a Complete Streets approach, and the potential for environmental impacts. Specifically, the City will need to determine if the benefits of the project outweigh the environmental issues identified in this EIR. Additionally, the City will need to determine whether they choose to implement a Complete Streets concept in this area of Oceanside, which would decrease the thoroughfare from four travel lanes to two lanes, although there are some in the community who are not in favor of the change.

While the majority of this EIR focuses on the option of converting Coast Highway from four lanes to two lanes (one travel lane in each direction) for the 3.5-mile length of the Coast Highway corridor, the City could also opt to adopt an alternative that narrows the extent of the improvements, which is proposed in Alternative 1 and Alternative 2. Alternative 1 would retain four lanes south of Oceanside Boulevard, while Alternative 2 would retain four lanes south of Morse Street. Refer to Chapter 5 for further consideration of these alternatives.

## S.6 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Recommended Mitigation Measures – Proposed Project

**Table S-1** provides a summary of the identified issue areas and whether the Complete Streets or the Incentive District project components would cause a significant impact with regard to the issue area.

Where impacts were determined to be significant, **Tables S-2** and **S-3** provide more detail on the potential impacts, recommended mitigation measures, and significance conclusions after mitigation.

The substantiations for less-than-significant impact conclusions are included in the topical sections of Chapter 3 for most issue areas. A brief analysis of agriculture and forest resources and mineral resources is also found in Chapter 6 of this EIR, given the insignificant nature of these issue areas for the project.

**TABLE S-1**  
**SUMMARY OF EFFECTS, OCEANSIDE COAST HIGHWAY CORRIDOR STUDY**

Environmental Impact Issue Area	Complete Streets	Incentive District
<b>Aesthetics</b>		
Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	No	No
Would the project substantially damage scenic resources, including but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	No	No
Would the project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	No	No
Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area?	No	No
<b>Agriculture and Forest Resources</b>		
Would the project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	No	No
Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	No	No
Would the project result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	No	No
Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	No	No
<b>Air Quality</b>		
Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	No	No
Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	No	Potential significant impact, see Table S-3
Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	No	Potential significant impact, see Table S-3
Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	No	Potential significant impact, see Table S-3
Would the project create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	No	No

**TABLE S-1  
SUMMARY OF EFFECTS, OCEANSIDE COAST HIGHWAY CORRIDOR STUDY**

<b>Environmental Impact Issue Area</b>	<b>Complete Streets</b>	<b>Incentive District</b>
<b>Biological Resources</b>		
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 the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	Potential significant impact, see Table S-2	Potential significant impact, see Table S-3
Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	Potential significant impact, see Table S-2	Potential significant impact, see Table S-3
Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including but not limited to marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	Potential significant impact, see Table S-2	Potential significant impact, see Table S-3
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?	No	No
Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	No	No
Would the project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	No	Potential significant impact, see Table S-3
<b>Cultural Resources</b>		
Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?	Potential significant impact, see Table S-2	Potential significant impact, see Table S-3
Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	Potential significant impact, see Table S-2	Potential significant impact, see Table S-3
Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	No	Potential significant impact, see Table S-3
Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	Potential significant impact, see Table S-2	Potential significant impact, see Table S-3
Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource as defined in Public Resources Code 21074?	Potential significant impact, see Table S-2	Potential significant impact, see Table S-3
<b>Geology, Soils, and Seismicity</b>		
Would the project expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including risk of loss, injury, or death involving: (1) 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; (2) strong seismic ground-shaking; (3) seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction; or landslides?	No	No
Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	No	No

**TABLE S-1  
SUMMARY OF EFFECTS, OCEANSIDE COAST HIGHWAY CORRIDOR STUDY**

<b>Environmental Impact Issue Area</b>	<b>Complete Streets</b>	<b>Incentive District</b>
Would the project 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-site or off-site landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?	No	No
Would the project be located on expansive soils, creating substantial risks to life or property?	No	No
Would the project have soils incapable of adequately supporting septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	No	No
<b>Greenhouse Gas</b>		
Would the project generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	No	Potential significant impact, see Table S-3
Would the project conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs?	No	No
<b>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</b>		
Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	No	No
Would the project 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?	No	No
Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	No	No
Would the project 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 the environment?	No	Potential significant impact, see Table S-3
Would the project be located within an area covered by an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, and would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	No	No
Would the project be within the vicinity of a private airstrip and would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	No	No
Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	No	No
<b>Hydrology and Water Quality</b>		
Would the project violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	No	No
Would the project substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table (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 approved)?	No	No

**TABLE S-1  
SUMMARY OF EFFECTS, OCEANSIDE COAST HIGHWAY CORRIDOR STUDY**

<b>Environmental Impact Issue Area</b>	<b>Complete Streets</b>	<b>Incentive District</b>
Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion, siltation on- or offsite?	No	No
Would the project 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?	No	No
Would the project create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	No	No
Would the project otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	No	No
Would the project place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	No	No
Would the project place structures within a 100-year flood hazard area which would impede or redirect flood flows?	No	No
Would the project 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?	No	No
Would the project result in inundation by seiche, tsunami or mudflow?	No	No
<b>Land Use and Public Policy</b>		
Would the project physically divide an established community?	No	No
Would the project conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	No	No
<b>Mineral Resources</b>		
Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	No	No
Would the project result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?	No	No
<b>Noise and Vibration</b>		
Would the project result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	No	No
Would the project result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	No	Potential significant impact, see Table S-3
Would the project result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	No	Potential significant impact, see Table S-3
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?	Potential significant impact, see Table S-2	Potential significant impact, see Table S-3

**TABLE S-1  
SUMMARY OF EFFECTS, OCEANSIDE COAST HIGHWAY CORRIDOR STUDY**

<b>Environmental Impact Issue Area</b>	<b>Complete Streets</b>	<b>Incentive District</b>
For a project located within an airport land use plan area or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the area to excessive noise levels?	No	No
For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	No	No
<b>Population and Housing</b>		
Would the project induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure) beyond the growth characterized by the project description and addressed in the technical analyses of the EIR?	No	No
Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	No	No
Would the project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	No	No
<b>Public Services</b>		
Would the project result in a significant impact with respect to public services if it would result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered government facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for public services?	No	No
<b>Recreation and Parks</b>		
Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	No	No
Would the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities in order to maintain performance objectives, which might have an adverse physical impact on the environment?	No	No
<b>Transportation and Traffic</b>		
Would the project conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy 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?	Potential significant impact, see Table S-2	Potential significant impact, see Table S-3
Would the project conflict with an applicable congestion management program including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	No	No
Would the project result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	No	No
Would the project substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	No	No

**TABLE S-1  
SUMMARY OF EFFECTS, OCEANSIDE COAST HIGHWAY CORRIDOR STUDY**

<b>Environmental Impact Issue Area</b>	<b>Complete Streets</b>	<b>Incentive District</b>
Would the project result in inadequate emergency access or impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	Potential significant impact, see Table S-2	Potential significant impact, see Table S-3
Would the project conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	No	No
<b>Utilities</b>		
Would the project exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	No	No
Would the project require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	No	No
Would the project require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	No	No
Would the project require new or expanded water service entitlements?	No	No
Would the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project determine that they have inadequate capacity to serve the projects projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	No	No
Would the project not be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	No	No
Would the project conflict with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	No	No

**TABLE S-2  
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES FOR THE COMPLETE STREETS PROJECT COMPONENT**

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance Determination after Mitigation
<b>Biological Resources</b>		
<p><b>Impact Complete Streets BIO-1: Migratory Birds.</b> Migratory birds (including raptors) have the potential to occur within the Complete Streets improvements area and could be impacted by the project as a result of tree removal and/or construction during the breeding season. Migratory birds may nest in trees located along the area planned for the Complete Streets improvements. If trees with nesting birds were to be removed, direct mortality to individuals or eggs could occur, which would be considered a significant impact.</p>	<p><b>MM Complete Streets BIO-1:</b> Tree removal shall take place outside of the migratory bird breeding season (February 15 through August 31). If avoidance is not feasible and tree removal is required during the avian breeding season, the following measures shall be followed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. A nesting bird survey of trees planned for removal and within 300 feet of construction activities shall be conducted by a qualified avian biologist no more than 1 week prior to commencement of tree removal activities. A qualified avian biologist refers to a person with the ability to identify birds present in San Diego County to the species level by sight or sound and who is familiar with the breeding and nesting behaviors of native bird species.</li> <li>b. If active nests with eggs or chicks of bird species protected under the MBTA are detected within trees or shrubs planned for removal, the trees will remain in place until it has been determined by the avian biologist that the nest is no longer active. If active nests are detected within 300 feet of physical construction activities, an appropriate buffer shall be determined by the avian biologist and no work shall take place within the buffer until it is determined that the nest is no longer active. Additional visits after the initial survey shall be conducted as necessary to determine that nests are no longer active.</li> </ul>	Less than Significant
<p><b>Impact Complete Streets BIO-2: Light-Footed Ridgeway's Rail.</b> Physical construction activities south of Vista Way may generate noise above baseline levels at a distance of less than 300 feet from potential habitat for light-footed Ridgeway's rails, resulting in a potentially significant impact to this special-status species.</p>	<p><b>MM Complete Streets BIO-2:</b> For physical construction activities occurring less than 300 feet from potential light-footed Ridgeway's rail habitat associated with Buena Vista Lagoon (activities south of 33.169759°, -117.357623°, including the activities planned near the Buena Vista Audubon Society building), focused protocol surveys shall be conducted by a permitted biologist. If no rails are detected, construction may commence. If rails are detected, consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) would be required and may include non-disturbance areas within 300 feet of territories, implementation of noise attenuation measures, and/or daily biological monitoring and daily noise monitoring during the course of construction activities to confirm that construction activities are not adversely impacting nesting or foraging activities.</p>	Less than Significant

**TABLE S-2**  
**SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES FOR THE COMPLETE STREETS PROJECT COMPONENT**

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance Determination after Mitigation
<p><b>Impact Complete Streets BIO-3: Western Yellow Bats.</b> Western yellow bats may occur within skirted palm trees within the Complete Streets improvements area. Removal of skirted palm trees, if required for roundabout installation, may result in direct western yellow bat mortality or disturbance of maternity roosts, and would be considered a significant impact.</p>	<p><b>MM Complete Streets BIO-3:</b> This mitigation measure shall be required if removal of palm trees is proposed as part of the Complete Streets project. To avoid impacts to western yellow bats, a qualified biologist (a biologist with the ability to identify bat guano and assess habitat suitability for western yellow bats) shall inspect the base of palm skirts for guano prior to removal of skirted palm trees (i.e., palm trees with several layers of accumulated dead fronds). If bats are detected, tree removal shall avoid the yellow bat maternity season (June 1 through August 31). If tree removal cannot avoid the maternity season, bat protection protocols shall be identified and implemented by a qualified bat biologist and approved by CDFW. The protocols may require installation of bat exclusionary devices, followed by up to 4 weeks of nightly monitoring by a qualified biologist to confirm bats are being excluded without harm until it is determined bats are no longer present. The protocols may also require construction of substitute bat habitat (i.e., bat boxes, artificial tree structures) in the vicinity of bat-occupied palm trees, followed by monitoring by a qualified biologist to confirm bats are using the bat habitat.</p>	Less than Significant
<p><b>Impact Complete Streets BIO-4: Riparian and Sensitive Habitats.</b> Physical construction activities that could indirectly impact riparian habitats and sensitive natural communities at Loma Alta Creek and Buena Vista Marsh include mid-block crosswalks proposed across Coast Highway adjacent to the Loma Alta Creek footpath (south of the existing Loma Alta Creek bridge) and near the Buena Vista Audubon Society driveway south of Eaton Street near Buena Vista Lagoon.</p>	<p><b>MM Complete Streets BIO-4:</b> To avoid indirect impacts to riparian habitats and sensitive natural communities adjacent to the San Luis Rey River, Loma Alta Creek, and Buena Vista Lagoon, the following measures shall be implemented:</p> <p>a. Species with a rating of moderate or high on the California Invasive Plant Council Inventory Database shall not be used for streetscaping in the Complete Streets project components. b. In areas with potential for erosion or construction-generated runoff, sedimentation, or dust from construction activities to impact adjacent Habitat Group A through E communities, best management practices (BMPs), such as silt fencing and/or straw wattles, shall be installed on the downslope portion of grading or disturbance areas during project construction activities. This measure applies to Complete Streets improvements south of Eaton Street and adjacent to Loma Alta Creek.</p>	Less than Significant
<p><b>Impact Complete Streets BIO-5: Wetlands and Other Waters.</b> Physical construction activities that could indirectly impact federal or state wetlands or other waters include mid-block crosswalks proposed across Coast Highway adjacent to the Loma Alta Creek footpath (south of the existing Loma Alta Creek bridge) and near the Buena Vista Audubon Society driveway south of Eaton Street near Buena Vista Lagoon.</p>	Implement MM Complete Streets BIO-4.	Less than Significant
<b>Cultural Resources</b>		
<p><b>Impact Complete Streets CR-1: Historical Resources, as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5.</b> Although the Complete Streets improvements area is largely developed, there exists the possibility that subsurface</p>	<p><b>MM Complete Streets CR-1:</b> Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the City of Oceanside shall enter into a pre-excavation agreement with a representative of the San Luis Rey Band of Mission Indians, otherwise known as a Tribal Cultural Resources Treatment and Tribal Monitoring Agreement. A copy of the agreement shall be included</p>	Less than Significant

**TABLE S-2  
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES FOR THE COMPLETE STREETS PROJECT COMPONENT**

<b>Environmental Impact</b>	<b>Mitigation Measures</b>	<b>Significance Determination after Mitigation</b>
<p>prehistoric and historic-period archaeological resources have been paved over and are obscured. As such, the Complete Streets improvements area should be considered sensitive for the presence of archaeological resources and the project has the potential to significantly impact undocumented subsurface archaeological deposits that may qualify as historical resources.</p>	<p>in the grading plan submittals for the grading permit. The purpose of this agreement shall be to formalize protocols and procedures between the Applicant/Owner and the San Luis Rey Band for the protection and treatment of, including but not limited to, Native American human remains, funerary objects, cultural and religious landscapes, ceremonial items, traditional gathering areas and cultural items, located and/or discovered through a monitoring program in conjunction with the construction of the Complete Streets improvements, including additional archaeological surveys and/or studies, excavations, geotechnical investigations, grading, and all other ground-disturbing activities, such as the installation and/or removal of infrastructure and existing foundations, that may impact the native soils subsurface to the existing road bed.</p> <p><b>MM Complete Streets CR-2:</b> Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the grading contractor shall provide a written and signed letter to the City Planner stating that a qualified archaeologist and Luiseño Native American Monitor have been retained at the grading contractor's expense to implement the monitoring program, as described in the pre-excavation agreement.</p> <p><b>MM Complete Streets CR-3:</b> Prior to the release of the grading bond, a monitoring report and/or evaluation report, if appropriate, which describes the results, analysis and conclusions of the archaeological monitoring program (e.g., data recovery plan) shall be submitted by the qualified archaeologist, along with the Luiseño Native American monitor's notes and comments, to the City Planner for approval.</p> <p><b>MM Complete Streets CR-4:</b> The qualified archaeologist shall maintain ongoing collaborative consultation with the Luiseño Native American monitor during all ground-disturbing activities that may impact subsurface native soils. The requirement for the monitoring program shall be noted on all applicable construction documents, including demolition plans, grading plans, etc. The grading contractor shall notify the City Planner of the start and end of all ground-disturbing activities.</p> <p><b>MM Complete Streets CR-5:</b> The qualified archaeologist and Luiseño Native American Monitor shall attend all applicable pre-construction meetings with the general contractor and/or associated subcontractors to present the archaeological monitoring program. The qualified archaeologist and Luiseño Native American Monitor shall be present on-site during any ground-disturbing activities that may impact subsurface native soils.</p> <p><b>MM Complete Streets CR-6:</b> The qualified archaeologist or the Luiseño Native American monitor may halt ground-disturbing activities if unknown archaeological artifact deposits or cultural features are discovered. Ground-disturbing activities shall be directed away from these deposits to allow a determination of potential importance. Isolates and clearly non-significant deposits will be minimally documented in the field, and before grading proceeds these items shall be given to the San Luis Rey Band so that they may be repatriated at the site on a later date. If a determination is made that the unearthed artifact deposits or cultural features are considered potentially significant, the San Luis</p>	

**TABLE S-2**  
**SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES FOR THE COMPLETE STREETS PROJECT COMPONENT**

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance Determination after Mitigation
	<p>Rey Band shall be notified and consulted with in regards to the respectful and dignified treatment of those resources.</p> <p>The avoidance and protection of the significant cultural resource and/or unique archaeological resource is the preferable mitigation. If, however, a data recovery plan is authorized by the City as the Lead Agency under CEQA, the San Luis Rey Band shall be notified and consulted regarding the drafting and finalization of any such recovery plan. For significant artifact deposits or cultural features that are part of a data recovery plan, an adequate artifact sample to address research avenues previously identified for sites in the project area will be collected using professional archaeological collection methods. If the qualified archaeologist collects such resources, the Luiseño Native American monitor must be present during any testing or cataloging of those resources. Moreover, if the qualified archaeologist does not collect the cultural resources that are unearthed during the ground-disturbing activities, the Luiseño Native American monitor, may at their discretion, collect said resources and provide them to the San Luis Rey Band for respectful and dignified treatment in accordance with the Tribe's cultural and spiritual traditions.</p> <p><b>MM Complete Streets CR-7:</b> Any and all uncovered tribal cultural resources of Native American importance shall be returned to the San Luis Rey Band of Mission Indians, and/or the Most Likely Descendant, if applicable, and not be curated.</p> <p><b>MM Complete Streets CR-8:</b> As specified by California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5, if human remains are found in the project area during construction or during archaeological work, the person responsible for the excavation, or his or her authorized representative, shall immediately notify the San Diego County Coroner's office by telephone. No further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains shall occur until the Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition pursuant to PRC 5097.98. If such a discovery occurs, a temporary construction exclusion zone shall be established, surrounding the area of the discovery so that the area would be protected, and consultation and treatment could occur as prescribed by law. By law, the Coroner will determine within two working days of being notified if the remains are subject to his or her authority. If the Coroner recognizes the remains to be Native American, he or she shall contact the NAHC within 24 hours. The NAHC will make a determination as to the Most Likely Descendant. If Native American remains are discovered, the remains shall be kept in situ, or in a secure location in close proximity to where they were found, and the analysis of the remains shall only occur on-site in the presence of a Luiseño Native American monitor.</p> <p><b>MM Complete Streets CR-9:</b> The qualified archeologist, or an archaeologist working under the direction of the qualified archaeologist, and the Luiseño Native American monitor shall conduct pre-construction cultural resources sensitivity training to inform construction personnel of the types of cultural resources that may be encountered, and of the proper procedures to be enacted in the event of an inadvertent discovery of</p>	

**TABLE S-2**  
**SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES FOR THE COMPLETE STREETS PROJECT COMPONENT**

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance Determination after Mitigation
	archaeological resources or human remains. The applicant shall ensure that construction personnel are made available for and attend the training and shall retain documentation demonstrating attendance.	
<p><b>Impact Complete Streets CR-2: Archeological Resources, as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5.</b> No known archaeological resources that would qualify as unique archaeological resources pursuant to CEQA will be impacted as a result of project implementation. However, there exists the possibility that subsurface prehistoric and historic-period archaeological resources that could qualify under Section 15064.5 underlie the Complete Streets improvements, and the area is considered sensitive for the presence of archaeological resources. As such the Complete Streets improvements have the potential to impact undocumented subsurface archaeological deposits that may qualify as unique archaeological resources.</p>	Implement MM Complete Streets CR-1 through CR-9.	Less than Significant
<p><b>Impact Complete Streets CR-3: Discovery of Human Remains.</b> No known human remains exist within the Complete Streets improvements project area. However, since the nature of the proposed project would involve ground-disturbing activities, it is possible that such actions could unearth, expose, or disturb previously unknown human remains.</p>	Implement MM Complete Streets CR-1 through CR-9.	Less than Significant
<p><b>Impact Complete Streets CR-4: Tribal Cultural Resources.</b> Both the SLF search conducted by the NAHC and AB 52/SB 18 consultation conducted by the City have not identified any tribal cultural resources within the Complete Streets improvements area. However, this does not preclude the possibility that tribal cultural resources may be encountered as a result of further consultation or during proposed project ground disturbance. As such, there exists the possibility that project implementation may impact tribal cultural resources.</p>	Implement MM Complete Streets CR-1 through CR-9.	Less than Significant

**TABLE S-2**  
**SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES FOR THE COMPLETE STREETS PROJECT COMPONENT**

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance Determination after Mitigation
<b>Noise and Vibration</b>		
<p><b>Impact Complete Streets NOI-1: Traffic Noise, Wisconsin Avenue between Freeman Street and Ditmar Street.</b> The potential increase in project-related future traffic noise levels (due primarily to redistribution of traffic volumes from lane reduction along the Coast Highway corridor) along the roadway segment of Wisconsin Avenue, between Freeman Street and Ditmar Street would result in a significant impact. In this location increases in traffic noise compared to the 2035 Future Without Project Condition is predicted to be as much as 6.0 dBA CNEL.</p>	<p>Because of the configuration of existing land uses in this area, these impacts could not be avoided with implementation of the project. Specifically, existing residential uses and the Saint Mary Star of the Sea School are using the roadway segment of Wisconsin Avenue between Freeman Street and Ditmar Street for access. Thus, the addition of sound walls or other attenuation approaches are not feasible in this location. As such, noise impacts would be significant and unavoidable along this roadway segment.</p>	Significant and Unavoidable
<p><b>Impact Complete Streets NOI-2: Construction Noise.</b> Construction activities would increase existing ambient noise levels at noise sensitive receptors (i.e., residences) in proximity to the construction activity.</p>	<p><b>MM Complete Streets NOI-1:</b> The following field techniques shall be implemented by the City's construction contractor to reduce construction-related noise at nearby noise-sensitive receptors (residential uses):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Unless safety provisions require otherwise, the Complete Streets construction contractor shall adjust all audible back-up alarms to the lowest volume appropriate for safety purposes (i.e., still maintaining adequate signal-to-noise ratio for alarm effectiveness). The contractor shall consider signal persons, strobe lights, or alternative safety equipment and/or processes as allowed, for reducing reliance on high-amplitude sonic alarms.</li> <li>b. The construction contractor shall place stationary noise sources at the construction site, such as generators and air compressors, away from affected noise-sensitive receivers (residential and school uses). Non-noise-producing mobile equipment, such as trailers, shall be located in the direct sound pathways between suspected major noise-producing sources and sensitive receptors.</li> <li>c. Noise producing equipment (e.g., jackhammers and pavement breakers) shall use noise- attenuating shields, shrouds, or portable barriers or enclosures, to reduce operating noise.</li> <li>d. Line or cover hoppers, storage bins, and chutes shall include sound-deadening material (e.g., apply wood or rubber liners to metal bin impact surfaces).</li> <li>e. To the extent practicable and available, the construction contractor shall use construction equipment manufactured or modified to reduce noise and vibration emissions, such as: electric instead of diesel-powered equipment, hydraulic tools instead of pneumatic tools, and electric saws instead of air- or gasoline-driven saws.</li> </ol> <p><b>MM Complete Streets NOI-2:</b> Where feasible, the City's contractor shall install temporary, field-erected noise barriers to block the line-of-site between construction equipment and sensitive receptors prior to construction (in the Complete Streets project area these are limited to residential uses). Noise barriers could include sound blankets</p>	Significant and Unavoidable

**TABLE S-2  
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES FOR THE COMPLETE STREETS PROJECT COMPONENT**

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance Determination after Mitigation
	<p>hanging on existing fences, or the use of freestanding portable sound walls. Noise barriers should be a minimum of 8-feet in height and continuous between the source of noise and adjacent or nearby noise-sensitive receptors. Noise barriers are most effective when placed directly adjacent to either the noise source or receptor.</p> <p>Barrier construction may include, but not necessarily limited to, using appropriately thick wooden panel walls (at least one-half inch thick), as shown in Figure 3.10-2, which are tall enough to block the line-of-sight between the dominant construction noise source(s) and the noise-sensitive receptor. Such barriers can reduce construction noise by 5 to 15 dBA at nearby noise-sensitive receptor locations, depending on barrier height and length, and the distance between the barrier and the noise-producing equipment or activity. Alternatively, field-erected noise curtain assemblies could be installed around specific equipment sites or zones of anticipated mobile or stationary activity, resembling the sample shown in Figure 3.10-3. These techniques are most effective and practical when the construction activity noise source is stationary (e.g., auger or drill operation) and the specific source locations of noise emissions are near the ground and can be placed as close to the equipment/activity-facing side of the noise barrier as possible. Barrier layout and other implementation details would vary by construction site.</p> <p>Barrier material is assumed to be solid and dense enough to demonstrate acoustical transmission loss that is at least 10 dBA greater than the estimated noise reduction effect. These suggested barrier types do not represent the only ways to achieve the indicated noise reduction in dBA; they represent examples of how such noise attenuation might be attained by an implemented measure under the right conditions.</p> <p>With the noise reduction achieved with the noise barriers of MM Complete Streets NOI-2, the attenuated construction noise levels at a source would be reduced by 5 to 15 dBA Leq, which would attenuate to a less than substantial increase in daytime ambient noise levels at an adjacent residential uses. However, MM Complete Streets NOI-2 (i.e., barriers) may not be feasible to implement at all locations at all times during construction activities, due to potential physical constraints at a location which allow for line-of sight between a noise source and a residence. For example, existing fences may not be tall enough or sturdy enough to support noise blankets being attached and the placement of temporary barriers could endanger construction crew members and equipment and would restrict removal of impacted materials beneath the barriers. Therefore, impacts would be potentially significant and unavoidable with regard to a temporary substantial increase in ambient noise levels.</p>	

**TABLE S-2**  
**SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES FOR THE COMPLETE STREETS PROJECT COMPONENT**

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance Determination after Mitigation
<p><b>Impact Complete Streets NOI-3: Contribution to Cumulative Traffic Noise.</b> Cumulative noise effects are determined by comparing existing conditions to future (2035) traffic noise levels with the project. Comparing these two scenarios, significant cumulative the threshold would be exceeded for two street segments: along Wisconsin Avenue, between Freeman Street and Ditmar Street (5.4 dBA, CNEL) and along Washington Avenue, west of Coast Highway (5.8 dBA, CNEL). Therefore, future noise levels in these specific locations would be cumulatively significant.</p> <p>The project's contribution to the cumulative noise impacts along roadway segments can be determined by comparing projected future (2035) traffic noise levels without the project to the future (2035) traffic noise levels with the project. The project's contribution to increases in future noise levels along Wisconsin Avenue between Freeman Street and Ditmar Street is predicted to be 6.0 dBA CNEL and the project's contribution to increases in future noise levels along Washington Avenue west of Coast Highway is predicted to be 3.8 dBA CNEL. In both locations, the project's contribution would be perceptible (greater than 3 dBA). Therefore, the project contributes considerably to the significant cumulative impacts for the future (2035) traffic noise conditions along these two street segments. This is considered a significant impact of the project.</p>	<p>Sound walls are often used to address roadway noise impacts. However, due to the need for access points (for example, driveways to residences and street access to the Saint Mary Star of the Sea School), a wall could not be continuous and would not effectively shield the noise-sensitive uses from the roadway noise. In addition, the addition of sound walls would not be desirable as they would detract from the community character and visual quality of these neighborhoods. For these reasons, the addition of continuous sound walls to address these identified impacts would not be desirable or feasible. No other effective mitigation approaches are available. For these reasons, the project's contribution to cumulative noise impacts along Wisconsin Avenue (between Freeman Street and Ditmar Street) and Washington Avenue (west of Coast Highway) is considered cumulatively considerable and significant and unavoidable.</p>	<p>Significant and Unavoidable</p>

**TABLE S-2  
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES FOR THE COMPLETE STREETS PROJECT COMPONENT**

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance Determination after Mitigation																	
<b>Transportation and Traffic</b>																			
<p><b>Impact Complete Streets TR-1: Existing + Project Traffic Conditions.</b> Implementation of the Complete Streets improvements would result in an unacceptable LOS (LOS E or LOS F) at two study intersections, both of which are locations where roundabouts would be installed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>27. Coast Highway and Oceanside Boulevard – LOS F in PM peak hour (currently LOS D)</li> <li>35. Coast Highway and Cassidy Street – LOS F in PM peak hour (currently LOS B)</li> </ul>	<p><b>MM Complete Streets TR-1:</b> In order to mitigate the deficient LOS at the two study area intersections under the Existing + Project scenario, the City shall implement the following measures to improve intersection operations to an acceptable LOS. The City shall include the project modifications in the Complete Streets construction plans or completed prior to the finalization of the construction plans. The improvements shall be completed either prior to or concurrent with the Complete Streets improvements. The specific measures for the two degraded study intersections in the Existing + Project scenario are as follows:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="821 646 1619 979"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2"></th> <th rowspan="2">Measure</th> <th rowspan="2">Comments</th> <th colspan="2">Mitigated Conditions</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Delay (sec/vehicle)</th> <th>LOS</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>27</td> <td>Maintain Existing Traffic Signal</td> <td>Merging of two lanes into one lane would occur north of intersection before Wisconsin Avenue</td> <td>41.2</td> <td>D<sup>1</sup></td> </tr> <tr> <td>35</td> <td>Maintain Existing Signal</td> <td>No other adjustments required</td> <td>19.2</td> <td>B</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Note: <sup>1</sup> Since Intersection 27 is in the City's jurisdiction, LOS D is considered an acceptable LOS.</p> <p>Source: IBI 2018</p>		Measure	Comments	Mitigated Conditions		Delay (sec/vehicle)	LOS	27	Maintain Existing Traffic Signal	Merging of two lanes into one lane would occur north of intersection before Wisconsin Avenue	41.2	D <sup>1</sup>	35	Maintain Existing Signal	No other adjustments required	19.2	B	Less than Significant
	Measure				Comments	Mitigated Conditions													
		Delay (sec/vehicle)	LOS																
27	Maintain Existing Traffic Signal	Merging of two lanes into one lane would occur north of intersection before Wisconsin Avenue	41.2	D <sup>1</sup>															
35	Maintain Existing Signal	No other adjustments required	19.2	B															

**Impact Complete Streets TR-2: Future 2035 Traffic Conditions.** Under the Future 2035 Conditions + Project scenario intersections, implementation of the proposed project would cause unacceptable LOS (LOS E or LOS F) at the following study intersections:

- 4. Coast Highway & Surfdrider Way
- 6. Coast Highway & Pier View Way
- 15. Seagaze Street & Ditmar Street
- 21. Coast Highway & Wisconsin Boulevard
- 27. Coast Highway & Oceanside Boulevard
- 29. Coast Highway & Morse Street
- 35. Coast Highway & Cassidy Street
- 42. Vista Way & Ditmar Street
- 52. Oceanside Boulevard & I-5 Southbound On-/Off-Ramps
- 56. Vista Way & I-5 Southbound On-/Off-Ramps

**MM Complete Streets TR-2:** In order to mitigate the deficient LOS at the eight degraded study area intersections predicted under the Future + Project scenario, the City shall implement the following measures to improve intersection operations to an acceptable LOS. The City shall include the project modifications in the Complete Streets construction plans prior to the finalization of the construction plans. The improvements shall be completed either prior to or concurrent with the Complete Streets improvements. The nine mitigation measures for the eight degraded study intersections in the Future Conditions + Project scenario are in the followings summary table. Note that the Oceanside Boulevard and I-5 SB On-/Off-Ramps intersection has two specific measures to address both the AM and PM peak hours.

Significant and Unavoidable

	Measure	Comments	Mitigated Conditions	
			Delay (sec/vehicle)	LOS
4	Maintain Existing Traffic Signal	None	19.6	B
6	Maintain Existing Traffic Signal	None	8.7	A
15	Convert AWSC to Traffic Signal	None	13.20	B
27	Maintain Signal	None	47.4	D
29	Maintain existing Traffic Signal	None	25.9	C
35	Maintain existing Traffic Signal	Implementation of this mitigation measure will not fully mitigate the project's impacts to this intersection	66.4	E
42	Convert SSSC to Traffic Signal	None	11.5	B
52 (AM Peak Hour)	Southbound configuration will include two left turn lanes and a shared thru-right lane with a storage length of 100 feet	None	33.9	C
52 (PM Peak Hour)	Southbound configuration will include two left turn lanes and a shared thru-right lane with a storage length of 100 feet	Implementation of this mitigation measure will not fully mitigate the project's impacts to this intersection	44.2	D

Note:

<sup>1</sup> Under the Future Conditions without Project scenario, Intersection 52 (PM Peak-Hour) would operate at LOS C. Under the Future Conditions + Project scenario, this intersection would be degraded to LOS D, which is considered a significant impact under Caltrans guidelines. While the mitigation measure would reduce delay by 1.8 seconds, this intersection would still operate at LOS D and remain deficient.

---

SOURCE: IBI 2018

---

Implementation of MM Complete Streets TR-2 would improve operations at seven of the ten study intersections to better than the significance threshold. Project impacts to seven study intersections would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated under the Future Conditions + Project scenario. Although there are feasible mitigation measures for the following two intersections, implementation of the mitigation measures would not fully mitigate the impact of the project to these two intersections:

35. Coast Hwy & Cassidy St

52. Oceanside Boulevard & I-5 Southbound On-/Off-Ramps (PM peak-hour)

Therefore, even with incorporation of mitigation, the project's impact to these intersections would still be significant and unavoidable in the Future Conditions + Project scenario. In addition, there are no feasible mitigation measures that would reduce project impacts to a less than significant level at the following two intersections:

21. Coast Highway & Wisconsin Avenue

56. Vista Way & I-5 Southbound On-/Off-Ramps

In order to improve impacts to Coast Highway and Cassidy Street (Intersection 35) to a better operating condition than under the Future Conditions + Project scenario, this intersection would need to maintain the existing traffic signal. However, by doing so would disrupt the flow of traffic along Coast Highway due to the roundabout north of the intersection at Morse Street and immediately south of the intersection at Kelly Street. However, even with maintaining the traffic signal, LOS would not be improved to better than the level of significance. Furthermore, a signalized intersection is also not a viable solution as this intersection is integral to the continuity of the Complete Streets improvements throughout the corridor. For these reasons, project impacts to the intersection of Coast Highway and Cassidy Street would remain significant and unavoidable under the Future Conditions + Project scenario.

In order to reduce significant impacts to Coast Highway and Wisconsin Avenue (Intersection 21) to an operating condition that is less than significant under the Future Conditions + Project scenario, the capacity of the single-lane roundabout would need to be increased to a two-lane roundabout. However, the mid-corridor intersection at Coast Highway and Wisconsin Avenue has limited right-of-way, which prevents the installation of a two-lane roundabout. Furthermore, a signalized intersection is also not a viable solution as installation of a roundabout at this intersection is integral to the continuity of the Complete Streets improvements throughout the corridor. For these reasons, project impacts to the intersection of Coast Highway and Wisconsin Avenue would remain significant and unavoidable under the Future Conditions + Project scenario.

In order to address impacts to Oceanside Boulevard and I-5 Southbound On-/Off-Ramps (PM Peak-Hour) (Intersection 52) to an operating condition that is less than significant under the Future Conditions + Project scenario, lane modifications would be required to construct new through traffic lanes on Oceanside Boulevard at this location. This type of improvement was determined to be infeasible due to the proximity of the roadway to the adjacent Sprinter rail tracks to the south and the proximity of the intersection to the I-5

**TABLE S-2  
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES FOR THE COMPLETE STREETS PROJECT COMPONENT**

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance Determination after Mitigation
	<p>overpass above Oceanside Boulevard. The roadway right-of-way below the freeway overpass is very constrained and would not accommodate roadway widening. While the intersection is forecast to operate at a deficient level of service per Caltrans guidelines, the intersection conditions would not cause significant queuing of vehicles on the southbound off-ramp and would not impact mainline traffic conditions on I-5. For these reasons, project impacts to the intersection of Oceanside Boulevard and I-5 Southbound On-/Off-Ramps (PM Peak-Hour) would remain significant and unavoidable under the Future Conditions + Project scenario.</p> <p>In order to address impacts to Vista Way and I-5 Southbound On-/Off-Ramps (Intersection 56) to an operating condition that is less than significant under the Future Conditions + Project scenario, lane modifications would be required to construct new through traffic lanes in either the westbound or eastbound directions on Vista Way/SR-78. The addition of a westbound through lane at this location was determined to be infeasible due to the limited right-of-way available on Vista Way west of the intersection. Furthermore, with the recent road diet installed by the City along Vista Way east of this intersection, lane modifications would be inconsistent with the vision and goals of the City. Moreover, the addition of an eastbound through lane was also found to be infeasible. The configuration of the traffic lanes and bridge to the east of the intersection is not compatible with three eastbound through lanes on Vista Way. Caltrans and SANDAG have plans to reconfigure the I-5/SR-78/Vista Way interchange in the future, where the proposed reconfiguration would address the significant traffic impact identified for the intersection at Vista Way and I-5 Southbound On/Off Ramp. However, while this is currently in Caltrans and SANDAG's long-term plans, funding is not guaranteed with enough certainty to include the improvements in a CEQA-required future analysis scenario. Therefore, project impacts to the intersection of Vista Way and I-5 Southbound On/Off Ramps would remain significant and unavoidable under the Future Conditions + Project scenario.</p>	

**TABLE S-2  
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES FOR THE COMPLETE STREETS PROJECT COMPONENT**

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance Determination after Mitigation
<p><b>Impact Complete Streets TR-3: Emergency Access and Response.</b> The project would be phased so all construction activities would not occur simultaneously throughout the corridor. However, construction of the Complete Streets improvements would require temporary interference along Coast Highway and the 12 cross-streets where the intersection roundabouts are proposed. Temporary interferences would include partial lane closures, construction vehicles and equipment entering and exiting the project area, and pedestrian and/or bicycle lane closures. The partial lane and intersection closures along Coast Highway and proposed intersections could potentially result in temporary impacts to emergency access. There is the chance that temporary emergency access impacts could occur during an evacuation. Thus, a potentially significant impact associated with inadequate emergency access could occur during construction of the complete street improvements.</p>	<p><b>MM Complete Streets TR-3:</b> Prior to the start of construction of the Complete Streets improvements, the City shall require the construction contractor to prepare a Traffic Control Plan. The Traffic Control Plan will show all signage, striping, delineated detours, flagging operations and any other devices that will be used during construction to guide motorists safely through the construction area and allow for adequate access and circulation to the satisfaction of the City. The Traffic Control Plan will be prepared in accordance with the City’s traffic control guidelines and will be prepared to ensure that access will be maintained to individual properties, and that emergency access will not be restricted. The Traffic Control Plan will ensure that congestion and traffic delay are not substantially increased as a result of the construction activities. In addition, the City shall provide written notice at least 2 weeks prior to the start of construction to owners/occupants along streets to be affected during construction.</p> <p>During construction, the City will maintain continuous vehicular and pedestrian access to residential driveways from the public street to the private property line, except where necessary construction precludes such continuous access for reasonable periods of time. Access will be reestablished at the end of the workday. If a driveway needs to be closed or interfered with as described above, the City shall notify the owner or occupant of the closure of the driveway at least five working days prior to the closure. The Traffic Control Plan shall include provisions to ensure that the construction of the Complete Streets improvements does not interfere unnecessarily with the work of other agencies such as emergency service providers, mail delivery, school buses, and municipal waste services.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>

**TABLE S-3**  
**SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES FOR THE INCENTIVE DISTRICT**

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance Determination after Mitigation
<b>Air Quality</b>		
<p><b>Impact Incentive District AIR-1: Emissions During Construction.</b> Future project-specific construction activities that would occur as a result of the Incentive District would cause temporary, short-term emissions of nonattainment air pollutants in the Sand Diego Air Basin of O3 precursors (i.e., volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and nitrogen oxides (NOx)), and PM10 and PM2.5 as a result of construction activities. Information regarding the size, duration, and construction requirements of specific development projects would be required in order to quantify impacts associated with the construction activities of these individual projects. However, what is known at this time is that the construction of potential future projects under the Incentive District would be required to comply with applicable State and San Diego Air Pollution Control District (SDAPCD) air quality regulations, including the California Air Resources Board's (CARB's) on-road and off-road vehicle rules on idling limits and meeting stringent NOx, PM10, and PM2.5 exhaust standards; and SDAPCD Rules 55 and 51 (Fugitive Dust and Nuisance) that limit fugitive dust emissions. Individual development projects could exceed the SDAPCD thresholds specified for daily emissions of criteria air pollutants. Thus, even with compliance of these rules and regulations, future construction activities associated with the land uses permitted by the Incentive District would have the potential to contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. Therefore, this impact would be potentially significant.</p>	<p><b>MM Incentive District AIR-1a:</b> Prior to the issuance of a grading or building permit, whichever is required to be obtained first, individual development projects proposed under the Incentive District shall comply with the following land preparation, excavation, and/or demolition mitigation measures during construction activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All soil excavated or graded should be sufficiently watered to prevent excessive dust. Watering should occur with complete coverage of disturbed soil areas. Watering should be a minimum of twice daily on unpaved/untreated roads and on disturbed soil areas with active operations.</li> <li>• All clearing, grading, earth moving and excavation activities should cease: (a) during periods of winds greater than 20 mph (averaged over 1 hour as measured by an on-site anemometer or an off-site anemometer that is representative of the construction area), if disturbed material is easily windblown, or (b) when visible dust plumes impact public roads, occupied structures, or neighboring property.</li> <li>• Vehicles traveling over unpaved roadways shall be limited to 15 miles per hour or less. Signs shall be posted at construction sites identifying the maximum speed limit.</li> <li>• All trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose material shall be covered or maintain at least 2 feet or freeboards, in accordance with the requirements of California Vehicle Code (CVC) Section 23114.</li> <li>• If more than 5,000 cubic yards of fill material will be imported or exported from the site, then all haul truck access points shall be equipped with a gravel pad, rumble pad, or similar control to reduce vehicle trackout.</li> <li>• Adjacent streets with visible dust, dirt, sand, or soil material accumulation shall be cleaned and the accumulated material removed using street sweepers.</li> <li>• Stockpiles of soil or other fine loose material shall be stabilized by watering, covered with tarp, or other appropriate method to prevent wind-blown fugitive dust.</li> <li>• Where acceptable to the local fire department, weed control should be accomplished by mowing instead of digging, thereby, leaving the ground undisturbed and with a mulch covering.</li> <li>• Locate construction staging areas away from sensitive receptor areas, such as schools, to the extent practicable.</li> </ul>	<p>Significant and Unavoidable</p>

**TABLE S-3  
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES FOR THE INCENTIVE DISTRICT**

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance Determination after Mitigation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minimize the free drop height of excavated soil during batch-drop operations (i.e., earthwork with front-end loader or backhoe) so that the generation of dust is limited to the immediate area around the truck bed or storage pile.</li> <li>• Install project landscaping in appropriate areas as soon as construction in an area is complete to minimize exposed soils.</li> </ul> <p><b>MM Incentive District AIR-1b:</b> Prior to the issuance of a grading or building permit, whichever is required to be obtained first, individual proposed projects shall comply with the following construction equipment mitigation measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction equipment, on-road trucks, and emission control devices shall be properly maintained and tuned in accordance with manufacturer specifications.</li> <li>• Construction contractors shall be required to comply with California's on-road and off-road vehicle emissions regulations, including the CARB idling restrictions and the USEPA/CARB on-road and off-road diesel vehicle emissions standards, as required by 13 CCR, Sections 2485, 2025(h), and 2449.</li> <li>• Off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than 50 hp (e.g., excavators, graders, dozers, scrapers, tractors, loaders, etc.) shall be outfitted with Best Available Control Technology (BACT) devices certified by CARB such as certified Level 3 Diesel Particulate Filter or equivalent. A copy of each unit's certified BACT documentation and CARB or SCAQMD operating permit shall be provided at the time of mobilization of each applicable unit of equipment.</li> <li>• Route construction trucks away from sensitive receptor areas.</li> <li>• Where available, use electricity from power poles rather than temporary diesel or gasoline powered generators.</li> </ul> <p><b>MM Incentive District AIR-1c:</b> Construction contractors shall ensure that interior architectural coatings have a maximum of 10 grams per liter of VOC for both residential and commercial development.</p> <p><b>MM Incentive District AIR-2:</b> Prior to the issuance of a building permit, individual development projects proposed under the Incentive District regulations shall comply with the following mitigation measures:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Provide direct pedestrian and bicycle access from any Incentive District residential development with a density of four or more residences per acre and in any mixed-use or commercial development to the public right-of-way. Low-, medium-, and high-density Incentive District developments shall provide curbs and sidewalks on both sides of the street all public street frontages. Curbs and sidewalks shall also be provided on both sides of all internal streets, unless an equivalent or superior pedestrian path is provided within the development.</li> </ol>	

**TABLE S-3  
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES FOR THE INCENTIVE DISTRICT**

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance Determination after Mitigation
	<p>b. For medium to high density residential, mixed-use, or commercial developments in the Incentive District area where transit services exist but no transit stop is located within one-half mile of the development site or where transit service does not exist and the development project is within a transit district's sphere of influence, development projects shall provide plans indicating locations of bus turnouts and loading areas with shelters that are acceptable to the local transit provider.</p> <p>c. Promote the expanded use of renewable fuel and low-emission vehicles by including one or both of the following project components: provide preferential parking for ultra-low emission, zero-emission, and alternative-fuel vehicles; and/or provide electric vehicle supply equipment within the development that meets or exceeds the Tier 1 standards in the current 2016 Title 24 and 2016 California Green Building Standards. Nothing in this measure shall supersede an individual development project's legal responsibility to meet the applicable mandatory minimum requirements of the version of the Title 24 and California Green Building Standards in effect at the time of building permit issuance.</p> <p>d. Development projects shall be required to reduce energy consumption by designing buildings that meet or exceed the Tier 1 building energy budget standards in the current 2016 Title 24 and 2016 California Green Building Standards. Nothing in this measure shall supersede an individual development project's legal responsibility to meet the applicable mandatory minimum requirements of the version of the Title 24 and California Green Building Standards in effect at the time of building permit issuance.</p> <p>e. Development projects shall be required to reduce water consumption by installing water-efficient fixtures, appliances, toilets/urinals, and landscape irrigation systems that meet or exceed the Tier standards in the current 2016 Title 24 and 2016 California Green Building Standards. Nothing in this measure shall supersede an individual development project's legal responsibility to meet the applicable mandatory minimum requirements of the version of the Title 24 and California Green Building Standards in effect at the time of building permit issuance.</p> <p>f. Development projects shall promote transportation demand management principles such as peak hour trip reduction, staggered work hours, ride sharing, telecommuting, and the use of public transportation or other measures, as appropriate.</p>	
	<p>Because detailed information regarding individual development projects within the Incentive District is not currently available, it cannot be determined with certainty that the AIR-1a through AIR-1c and MM Incentive District AIR-2 would reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Additional feasible measures beyond the mitigation provided by MM Incentive District AIR-2 cannot be developed without knowing the exact nature of the proposed developments including but not limited to</p>	

**TABLE S-3  
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES FOR THE INCENTIVE DISTRICT**

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance Determination after Mitigation
<p><b>Impact Incentive District AIR-2: Cumulative Increases in Criteria Pollutants.</b> Implementation of the Incentive District would generate pollutant emissions from construction and operation al emissions from potential future development under the Incentive District. Future development that could occur as a result of adoption of the Incentive District could result in an increase in density or in the total amount of VMT relative to existing conditions, which may result in an overall increase in building and mobile source emissions, despite the improved energy and transportation efficiency and emissions reductions expected from buildings and mobile sources meeting increasingly more stringent energy efficiency and vehicle emissions standards.</p>	<p>the types and sizes of the proposed uses and associated trip generation rates. Because there is no way to accurately predict the nature or intensity of development projects under the Incentive District, this impact is considered significant and unavoidable.</p> <p>MM Incentive District AIR-1a through AIR-1c and MM Incentive District AIR-2 shall be implemented.</p> <p>MM Incentive District AIR-1a though AIR-1c, and MM Incentive District AIR-2 would reduce construction and operational emissions from future development that could occur as a result of adoption of the Incentive District. However, detailed information regarding individual development projects within the Incentive District is not currently available. Thus, it cannot be determined with certainty that the above measures would reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Additional feasible measures beyond the mitigation identified above cannot be developed without knowing the exact nature of the proposed developments, including but not limited to the types and sizes of the proposed uses and associated trip generation rates. Therefore, development under the Incentive District would potentially result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of a criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment. Therefore, impacts would be significant and unavoidable.</p>	<p>Significant and Unavoidable</p>
<p><b>Impact Incentive District AIR-3: Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Pollutants.</b> Given the amount of development that could happen under the Incentive District provisions, it is reasonable to assume that on a programmatic-level, some large-scale construction activities could occur in proximity to sensitive receptors that could expose sensitive receptors to substantial emissions of toxic air contaminants (TACs) that exceed the established significance thresholds, thereby potentially resulting in significant impacts. In addition, potential development and redevelopment under the Incentive District would generally result in an increase in density in the project corridor, and it is possible that sensitive uses could be located near sources of TAC emissions within the distances specified in the CARB advisory recommendations. For these reasons, impacts related to operational TAC emissions would be considered potentially significant when considering the various development projects that could be constructed under the Incentive District.</p>	<p><b>MM Incentive District AIR-3:</b> Prior to the issuance of a grading or building permit, whichever is required first, individual development projects proposed under the Incentive District shall comply with the following requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Projects locating sources of TAC emissions near sensitive receptors within the advisory guideline recommendations in the CARB Air Quality and Land Use Handbook (or future adopted subsequent document) shall conduct a health risk assessment to sufficiently demonstrate that impacts would not exceed the adopted significance thresholds inclusive of project-level design features, as appropriate and feasible. The types of projects that would be required to comply with this measure and more detail on the required features and recommendations are provided in Table 9 (CARB Recommendations on Siting and New Sensitive Land Uses).</li> <li>b. Projects requiring the use of diesel-fueled heavy-duty construction equipment that generates on-site emissions of one (1) pound per day of diesel particulate matter or more for a period of 6 months or more within 500 feet of sensitive receptors shall conduct a health risk assessment to sufficiently demonstrate that impacts would not exceed the adopted significance thresholds inclusive of project-level design features, as appropriate and feasible.</li> </ul>	<p>Less than Significant</p>

**TABLE S-3**  
**SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES FOR THE INCENTIVE DISTRICT**

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance Determination after Mitigation
<b>Biological Resources</b>		
<p><b>Impact Incentive District BIO-1: Migratory Birds.</b> Migratory birds (including raptors) have the potential to occur within the Incentive District area and could be impacted by future development during the breeding season. Removal of trees with nesting birds could result in direct mortality to individuals or eggs, which would be considered a significant impact. Construction noise could also result in a significant impact to breeding activities.</p>	<p><b>MM Incentive District BIO-1:</b> If tree removal is required for a project proposed under the Incentive District, tree removal and construction activities shall take place outside of the migratory bird breeding season (February 15 through August 31). If avoidance is not feasible and tree removal is required during the avian breeding season, the following measures shall be followed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A nesting bird survey of trees planned for removal and within 300 feet of construction activities shall be conducted by a qualified avian biologist no more than 1 week prior to commencement of tree removal activities. A qualified avian biologist refers to a person with the ability to identify birds present in San Diego County to the species level by sight or sound and who is familiar with the breeding and nesting behaviors of native bird species.</li> <li>If active nests with eggs or chicks of bird species protected under the MBTA are detected within trees or shrubs planned for removal, the trees will remain in place until it has been determined by the avian biologist that the nest is no longer active. If active nests are detected within 300 feet of physical construction activities, an appropriate buffer shall be determined by the avian biologist and no work shall take place within the buffer until it is determined that the nest is no longer active. Additional visits after the initial survey shall be conducted as necessary to determine that nests are no longer active.</li> </ol>	Less than Significant
<p><b>Impact Incentive District BIO-2: Light-Footed Ridgeway's Rail.</b> Indirect impacts to light-footed Ridgeway's rail related to noise during construction activities would occur within 300 feet or less of potential habitats for these species located at Buena Vista Lagoon. Noise above baseline levels during the breeding season at a distance of less than 300 feet would be considered a potentially significant impact to this special-status species.</p>	<p><b>MM Incentive District BIO-2:</b> For development activities occurring less than 300 feet from potential light-footed Ridgeway's rail habitat associated with Buena Vista Lagoon (development southwest of the intersection of Eaton Street and South Coast Highway), focused protocol surveys shall be conducted by a permitted biologist. If no rails are detected, construction may commence. If rails are detected, consultation with the USFWS would be required and may include non-disturbance areas within 300 feet of territories, implementation of noise attenuation measures, and/or daily biological monitoring and daily noise monitoring during the course of construction activities to confirm that construction activities are not adversely impacting nesting or foraging activities.</p>	Less than Significant
<p><b>Impact Incentive District BIO-3: Western Yellow Bats.</b> Western yellow bats also have the potential to have maternity roosts within palm trees within the Incentive District and could be directly impacted by palm tree removal.</p>	<p><b>MM Incentive District BIO-3:</b> This mitigation measure shall be required if removal of palm trees (which may contain western yellow bats) is proposed as part of a project proposed under the Incentive District. To avoid impacts to western yellow bats, a qualified biologist (a biologist with the ability to identify bat guano and assess habitat suitability for western yellow bats.) shall inspect the base of palm skirts for guano prior to removal of skirted palm trees (i.e., palm trees with several layers of accumulated dead fronds). If bats are detected, tree removal shall avoid the yellow bat maternity season (June 1 through August 31). If tree removal cannot avoid the maternity season, project-specific bat mitigation protocols shall be</p>	Less than Significant

**TABLE S-3  
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES FOR THE INCENTIVE DISTRICT**

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance Determination after Mitigation
<p><b>Impact Incentive District BIO-4: Special-status Plants.</b> Future projects implemented under the Incentive District have the potential to directly impact special-status plants where potential habitat for these species occurs within the Incentive District within the disturbed areas along the rail line, north of Loma Alta Creek, and south of Vista Way. Indirect impacts could also result from activities adjacent to habitat due to the introduction or spread of invasive species that compete with special-status plants or the generation of construction-related runoff, sedimentation, or dust that could degrade potential habitat.</p>	<p>identified and implemented by a qualified bat biologist and approved by CDFW. The protocols may require installation of bat exclusionary devices, followed by up to 4 weeks of nightly monitoring by a qualified biologist to confirm bats are being excluded without harm until it is determined bats are no longer present. The protocols may also require construction of substitute bat habitat (i.e., bat boxes, artificial tree structures) in the vicinity of bat-occupied palm trees, followed by monitoring by a qualified biologist to confirm bats are using the bat habitat.</p>	
<p><b>Impact Incentive District BIO-5: Riparian and Sensitive Habitats.</b> Future development and redevelopment which could occur under the Incentive District could result in direct impacts to riparian habitat and other sensitive natural communities through habitat removal or alteration, specifically within non-developed areas southwest of the intersection of Eaton Street and South Coast Highway, immediately north of Loma Alta Creek and along the railroad tracks. In addition, potential indirect effects, such as spread of invasive species or generation of construction-related runoff, sedimentation, or dust, may occur to adjacent vegetation communities associated with Loma Alta Creek and Buena Vista Lagoon.</p>	<p><b>MM Incentive District BIO-4:</b> To avoid impacts to narrow endemic rare plants, including Nutall's lotus, Coulter's saltbush, smooth tarplant, Orcutt's pincushion, Blochman's dudleya, cliff spurge, San Diego barrel cactus, decumbent goldenbush, sea dahlia, and spreading navarretia that may occur within the Incentive District, a qualified rare plant biologist shall conduct a preconstruction rare plant survey in areas with potential habitat for rare plants, including in areas that are considered disturbed. Qualified rare plant biologist refers to a person with knowledge of these species (appropriate plant survey windows and species identification). The qualified rare plant biological shall work with the City to identify project-specific measures that are consistent with the specifications of the Multiple Habitat Conservation Program and these measures shall be implemented prior to and concurrent with project construction, as applicable. Measures may include salvage of rare plants prior to construction, transfer of salvaged plants within similar habitat in non-impacted areas, followed up with monitoring by a qualified biologist to confirm at least 80% survival of salvaged plants.</p> <p><b>MM Incentive District BIO-5:</b> To avoid indirect and direct impacts to riparian habitats and sensitive natural communities near the San Luis Rey River, Loma Alta Creek, and Buena Vista Lagoon, the following measures shall be implemented:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. For non-developed areas southwest of the intersection of Eaton Street and South Coast Highway, immediately north of Loma Alta Creek and along the railroad tracks, the following measures shall be implemented to protect sensitive riparian or upland vegetation communities.             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. A site-specific assessment of biological resources by qualified biologist shall be conducted to confirm the absence or presence of sensitive biological resources prior to the City's approval of project plans. The qualified biologist shall determine the site-specific habitat type.</li> <li>ii. If the vegetation communities outlined in Table 3.3-1 would not be directly impacted by the proposed development project, no further assessment would be required.</li> <li>iii. If there is potential for riparian, wetland, and/or sensitive upland communities to be impacted, these impacts would be required to be compensated according to vegetation community type at the ratios</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	<p>Less than Significant</p>

**TABLE S-3  
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES FOR THE INCENTIVE DISTRICT**

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance Determination after Mitigation
<p><b>Impact Incentive District BIO-6: Wetlands and Other Waters.</b> Jurisdictional wetlands and waters within the Incentive District include Loma Alta Creek, a small patch of coastal brackish marsh comprised of saltgrass (<i>Distichlis</i> sp.) associated with Buena Vista Lagoon, and a small isolated disturbed wetland near the intersection of Cassidy Street and Broadway Street. Loma Alta Creek is within a concrete flood control channel; therefore, development activities associated with the Incentive District are unlikely to occur at this location. The disturbed wetland located near the intersection of Cassidy Street and Broadway Street is within the rail corridor which is designated as Public Utility Transportation Zone. This area is not considered developable per the land use/zoning designation. Additionally, all wetland areas within the Incentive District are subject to the no net loss policies of the MHCP and City Subarea Plan. While no significant impacts are anticipated to currently known wetland resources, the presence and distribution of wetland resources can change over time and a formal wetland delineation was not conducted throughout the entire Incentive District area. For these reasons, significant impacts could result with implementation of the projects developed under the Incentive District.</p>	<p>provided in Table 3.3-1 which supports the Multiple Habitat Conservation Program policy for no net loss of wetland/riparian vegetation and incorporates the mitigation ratios implemented in the City Subarea Plan. For impacts to these riparian and upland areas, a restoration/revegetation plan shall be prepared by a qualified restoration ecologist (experienced with riparian and upland restoration/revegetation planning) in coordination with the City and implemented by an experienced restoration contractor, with oversight by the City.</p> <p>b. The City shall prohibit the use of species with a rating of moderate or high on the California Invasive Plant Council Inventory Database in landscape plans used for development southwest of the corner of Eaton Street and South Coast Highway that is adjacent to undeveloped habitat.</p> <p>c. In areas where there is potential for erosion or construction-generated runoff, sedimentation, or dust from construction activities to impact adjacent Habitat Group A through E communities, best management practices (BMPs), such as silt fencing and/or straw wattles, shall be installed on the downslope portion of grading or disturbance areas during project construction activities. This measure applies to development southwest of intersection of Eaton Street and South Coast Highway and adjacent to Loma Alta Creek.</p>	Less than Significant

**TABLE S-3  
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES FOR THE INCENTIVE DISTRICT**

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance Determination after Mitigation
<p><b>Impact Incentive District BIO-7: Habitat Linkages and Wildlife Corridors.</b> Future development that may occur under the Incentive District would be prioritized within urban/developed areas which have limited potential to support wildlife movement or habitat linkages, but may occur within undeveloped habitat that function as habitat linkages. These types of impacts are consistent with those direct impacts discussed for sensitive vegetation communities such as habitat removal or alteration, and indirect impacts such as invasive species, construction-related runoff, sedimentation, and dust. Also, indirect impacts due to noise are not expected because the Incentive District is greater than 300 feet from areas identified as wildlife corridor planning zones in the City Subarea Plan.</p>	<p>MM Incentive District BIO-5 shall be implemented.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>
<p><b>Impact Incentive District BIO-8: Consistency with the MHCP.</b> The entire Incentive District is within the MHCP. While the developed area within the Incentive District is not considered a conserved vegetation community under the MHCP within non-developed areas southwest of the intersection of Eaton Street and South Coast Highway, Incentive District projects could affect MHCP Habitat Group A communities, including sensitive riparian and upland vegetation communities. These potential effects would be limited to the non-developed areas southwest of the intersections of Easton Street and Coast Highway and along the railroad tracks.</p>	<p>MM Incentive District BIO-5 shall be implemented.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>
<p><b>Cultural Resources</b></p>		
<p><b>Impact Incentive District CR-1: Historical Resources, as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5.</b> As noted above, the project area is considered sensitive for the presence of archaeological resources and future projects within the Incentive District area may significantly impact previously undocumented subsurface archaeological resources that may qualify as historical pursuant to CEQA. Furthermore, the Incentive District area contains one built environment resource that qualifies as a historical resource and 18 unevaluated built environment resources that may qualify as historical resources. As such, future projects within the Incentive District area have the potential to significantly impact historical resources.</p>	<p><b>MM Incentive District CR-1:</b> Individual development projects implemented under the Incentive District shall be subject to a Phase I cultural resources inventory (cultural resources inventory) prior to the City's approval of project plans. This requirement shall be implemented for all projects for which the Incentive District is employed (Administrative Approval, Development Plan Review, and Conditional Use Permit processing requirements as specified in Section 3901 of the Coast Highway Incentive District). The cultural resources inventory would consist of: a cultural resources records search to be conducted at the South Coastal Information Center; scoping with the California Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC); a pedestrian archaeological survey if visible ground surface is present; and recordation of all identified archaeological resources on California Department of Parks and Recreation 523 forms. The cultural resources inventory shall be carried out by a qualified archaeologist, defined as an archaeologist meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for professional archaeology, and</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>

**TABLE S-3**  
**SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES FOR THE INCENTIVE DISTRICT**

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance Determination after Mitigation
	<p>shall be conducted in consultation with the appropriate Native American groups as identified through outreach to the NAHC and through consultation.</p> <p>If potentially significant cultural resources are encountered during the survey, and if the project has the potential to impact those resources, the City shall require that the resources be evaluated for their eligibility for listing in the CRHR and for significance as unique archaeological resource. Recommendations shall be made for the treatment of unique archaeological resources or resources found eligible for the CRHR should the development project have the potential to adversely impact the resources. These studies shall be conducted in consultation with the City and the appropriate Native American groups as identified through consultation. Project redesign and preservation in place shall be the preferred means of mitigation to avoid impacts to significant cultural resources, including prehistoric and historic archaeological sites, locations of importance to Native Americans, human remains, historical buildings, structures and landscapes. Methods of avoidance may include, but shall not be limited to, project re-design or identification of protection measures such as capping or fencing. If it is demonstrated that resources cannot be avoided, the qualified archaeologist shall develop additional treatment measures, which may include data recovery or other appropriate measures, in consultation with the City and appropriate Native American groups as identified through consultation.</p> <p>In addition, the project proponent shall retain archaeological monitors and Native American monitors during ground-disturbing activities that have the potential to impact significant cultural resources as determined by a qualified archaeologist in consultation with the City and the appropriate Native American groups.</p> <p>During project-level construction, should prehistoric or historic subsurface cultural resources be discovered, all activity in the vicinity of the find shall stop and a qualified archaeologist shall be contacted to assess the significance of the find. If any find is determined to be significant, meaning it qualifies as a unique archaeological resource or is determined eligible for the CRHR, the archaeologist shall determine, in consultation with the City and the appropriate Native American groups, suitable avoidance measures, data recovery measures, or other appropriate mitigation, such as capping.</p> <p>All significant cultural materials recovered, either prior to or during construction, shall be, as necessary and at the discretion of the consulting archaeologist and in consultation with the appropriate Native American groups, subject to scientific analysis, professional museum curation, and documentation according to current professional standards. If materials need to be recovered, protocols for proper removal and treatment shall be implemented. The specific protocols for proper removal shall be detailed in a monitoring or data recovery plan prior to recovery of the materials.</p> <p><b>MM Incentive District CR-2:</b> Project-level development on individual properties containing structures at least 50 years old shall be subject to a historic built</p>	

**TABLE S-3  
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES FOR THE INCENTIVE DISTRICT**

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance Determination after Mitigation
<p><b>Impact Incentive District CR-2: Archeological Resources, as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5.</b> The Incentive District area contains three known archaeological resources, and is considered sensitive for the presence of archaeological resource that could qualify as unique archaeological resources under Section 15064.5. As such, future projects within the Incentive District could significantly impact previously undocumented subsurface archaeological resources that may qualify as unique archaeological resources.</p>	<p>Implement MM Incentive District CR-1 and CR-2</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>
<p><b>Impact Incentive District CR-3: Paleontological Resources and/or Unique Geologic Resources.</b> The SDNHM records search indicates that no previously record fossil localities have been previously documented in the Incentive District; however, the records search indicates that the project area is underlain by the Bay Point Formation and Santiago Formation, which are both considered of high sensitivity for the presence of fossiliferous deposits. Given that the Incentive District is underlain by paleontologically sensitive formations and that the depths of ground disturbance associated with future projects in the Incentive District are unknown, there exists the possibility that unique paleontological resources or unique geologic features may be impacted by future projects.</p>	<p><b>MM Incentive District CR-3:</b> For project-level development in the Incentive District involving ground disturbance, a qualified paleontologist shall be retained to determine the necessity of conducting a study of the project area(s) based on the potential sensitivity of the project for paleontological resources, and the potential for the project to impact paleontologically sensitive geological deposits. If deemed necessary, the paleontologist shall conduct a paleontological resources inventory designed to identify potentially significant resources. The paleontological resources inventory would consist of a paleontological resources records search to be conducted at the SDNHM; a field survey, if deemed appropriate by the paleontologist; and recordation of all identified paleontological resources. The paleontologist shall provide recommendations regarding additional work for the project. Impacts to significant paleontological resources, if identified, shall be avoided.</p> <p>In addition, the project proponent shall retain paleontological monitors during construction for ground-disturbing activities that have the potential to impact significant paleontological resources as determined by a qualified paleontologist.</p> <p>In the event that paleontological resources are discovered, the project proponent will notify a qualified paleontologist. The paleontologist will document the discovery as needed, evaluate the potential resource, and assess the significance of the find under the criteria set forth in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5. If fossil or fossil</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>

**TABLE S-3  
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES FOR THE INCENTIVE DISTRICT**

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance Determination after Mitigation
	<p>bearing deposits are discovered during construction, excavations within 50 feet of the find will be temporarily halted or diverted until the discovery is examined by a qualified paleontologist, in accordance with Society of Vertebrate Paleontology standards. The paleontologist will notify the appropriate agencies to determine procedures that would be followed before construction is allowed to resume at the location of the find. If avoidance is determined to be infeasible, the qualified paleontologist shall implement a paleontological mitigation program. At each fossil locality, field data forms shall be used to record pertinent geologic data, stratigraphic sections shall be measured, appropriate sediment samples shall be collected and submitted for analysis, and any other activities necessary for the timely and professional documentation and removal of fossils. Any fossils encountered and recovered shall be prepared to the point of identification, catalogued, and donated to a public, non-profit institution with a research interest in the materials. Accompanying notes, maps, and photographs shall also be filed at the repository.</p>	
<p><b>Impact Incentive District CR-4: Discovery of Human Remains.</b> No known human remains exist within the complete Incentive District. However, since the nature of the proposed project would involve ground-disturbing activities, it is possible that such actions could unearth, expose, or disturb previously unknown human remains.</p>	<p>Implement MM Incentive District CR-1 and CR-2</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>
<p><b>Impact Incentive District CR-5: Tribal Cultural Resources.</b> Both the SLF search conducted by the NAHC and AB 52/SB 18 consultation conducted by the City have not identified any tribal cultural resources within the Incentive District project area. However, this does not preclude the possibility that tribal cultural resources may be encountered during the implementation of future projects within the Incentive District project area. As such, there exists the possibility that future projects may impact tribal cultural resources.</p>	<p>Implement MM Incentive District CR-1 and CR-2</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>
<b>Greenhouse Gas</b>		
<p><b>Impact Incentive District GHG-1: Project-specific Greenhouse Gas Emissions.</b> Given the amount of development that could occur with implementation of the Incentive District, it is reasonable to assume that in the aggregate, development projects could eventually result in a net increase in GHG emissions over current emission levels in excess of the County's proposed screening level threshold which is 900 MT of CO<sub>2</sub>e per year. Therefore,</p>	<p>Implement MM Incentive District AIR-2</p> <p>Compliance with current and future Title 24 standards and MM Incentive District AIR-2 would result in development projects which are more energy efficient than current development, relying on a wide array of strategies such as, possibly, solar water heating and photovoltaic roofs, Energy Star® appliances, etc., resulting a reduction in GHG emissions as compared to current practices. There are no additional feasible mitigation measures available. Thus, even with MM Incentive</p>	<p>Significant and Unavoidable</p>

**TABLE S-3  
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES FOR THE INCENTIVE DISTRICT**

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance Determination after Mitigation
implementation of the Incentive District could result in significant GHG emissions.	District AIR-2, the net increase in GHG emissions in the aggregate could exceed thresholds, and impacts are considered significant and unavoidable.	
<b>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</b>		
<p><b>Impact Incentive District HAZ-1: Release of Hazardous Materials.</b> Future soil excavation activities within the Incentive District could encounter contaminated soil, soil vapor, and/or groundwater contamination at or associated with Buck's Texaco (628 South Coast Highway), Pop's Hot Rod Garage (305 Wisconsin Avenue), Rashid South Hill Shell (1202 South Coast Highway), H.G. Fenton (1517 South Coast Highway), Mobil 18 GCL (1742 South Coast Highway), Econo Lube'N Tube (1942 South Coast Highway), and Golden State Gas Inc. (1943 South Coast Highway). For projects that would disturb 1 acre or greater at a time, the project would be required to comply with the Construction General Permit. This requires preparation and implementation of a site-specific Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan, which would contain BMPs to prevent pollutants (including sediment and hazardous materials) from leaving the site in runoff. Nevertheless, the potential for contaminated soil and soil vapor to be encountered and released into the environment during project construction would be considered a significant impact. Because the timing of the future Incentive District projects is unknown, it is also unknown whether the contaminated sites listed above would be remediated by then. For this reason, this would be a potentially significant impact of the projects implemented under the Incentive District.</p>	<p><b>MM Incentive District HAZ-1:</b> To assess the status of the remediation of the contaminated sites listed above, as well as checking for any newly contaminated sites, individual project proponents for each proposed project within the Incentive District area (the applicant or its contractor) shall conduct a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment in general accordance with ASTM Standard 1527-13, Standard Practice for Environmental Site Assessments: Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Process, or later versions if any. The ASTM standard requires checking for active contaminated sites within a specified radius that have the potential to affect a given project. In the event that the extent of contamination from a site extends to a proposed project site, the applicant or its contractor for each proposed project would implement MM Incentive District HAZ-2.</p> <p><b>MM Incentive District HAZ-2:</b> If the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment prepared in accordance with MM Incentive District HAZ-1 determines that contamination of a project site proposed for development is present, the following additional measures shall be required:</p> <p>a. The applicant's construction contractor(s) shall prepare and implement a site-specific Health and Safety Plan in accordance with 29 CFR 1910.120 to protect construction workers and the public during all excavation and grading activities. This plan shall be submitted to the City for review prior to commencement of construction. Note that the project applicant or its contractor would also be required to implement MM Incentive District HAZ-2b, Soil and Groundwater Management Plan, described further below. The Health and Safety Plan shall include, but is not limited to, the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Designation of a trained, experienced site safety and health supervisor who has the responsibility and authority to develop and implement the site health and safety plan;</li> <li>• A summary of all potential risks to construction workers and maximum exposure limits for all known and reasonably foreseeable site chemicals;</li> <li>• Specified personal protective equipment and decontamination procedures, if needed;</li> <li>• Emergency procedures, including route to the nearest hospital; and</li> <li>• Procedures to be followed in the event that evidence of potential soil contamination (such as soil staining, noxious odors, debris or buried storage containers) is encountered. These procedures shall be in accordance with hazardous waste operations regulations and specifically</li> </ul>	Less than Significant

**TABLE S-3  
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES FOR THE INCENTIVE DISTRICT**

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance Determination after Mitigation
	<p>include, but are not limited to, the following: immediately stopping work in the vicinity of the unknown hazardous materials release, notifying the County of San Diego Department of Environmental Health, and retaining a qualified environmental firm to perform sampling and remediation.</p> <p>b. In support of the Health and Safety Plan described above, the applicant or its contractor shall develop and implement a Soil and Groundwater Management Plan that includes a materials disposal plan specifying how the construction contractor will remove, handle, transport, and dispose of all excavated material and groundwater from dewatering activities in a safe, appropriate, and lawful manner. The plan must identify protocols for soil and groundwater testing and disposal, identify the approved disposal site, and include written documentation that the disposal site will accept the waste. Contract specifications shall mandate full compliance with all applicable local, state, and federal regulations related to the identification, transportation, and disposal of hazardous materials, including those encountered in excavated soil or groundwater.</p>	
<b>Noise and Vibration</b>	<p><b>MM Incentive District NOI-1:</b> For development projects considered under the Incentive District provisions, a project-level vibration analysis would be required if the construction plans for the project would include the use of any of the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Typical heavy construction equipment within 25 feet of existing inhabited structures. Typical heavy equipment is defined as equipment with an engine size of 600 horsepower or greater and includes: large dozers, large excavators, and large loaders.</li> <li>2. Vibratory compaction rollers for use within 80 feet of inhabited structures.</li> <li>3. Pile drivers are proposed for use within 150 feet of inhabited structures.</li> </ol> <p>If none of the construction methods mentioned in the enumerated list above are proposed within the described boundaries, no further analysis would be required since the distances to sensitive receptors would create enough of a buffer to ensure impacts are less than significant.</p> <p>The purpose of each project-level vibration analysis would be to determine if the specific project-level construction would generate vibration levels exceeding the human perception threshold of 0.1 in/sec PPV at the receptor. Project specific details that would be required in each analysis would include, but not be limited to, actual construction equipment type, sizes, and horsepower to be used, specific locations of each activity, and actual distances from the activity to inhabited buildings. Vibration levels of actual equipment to be used shall be estimated from Federal Transit Administration (FTA) vibration guidance documents (FTA 2006), attenuated with distance to the inhabited structures, and compared to the Caltrans vibration threshold for human perception. If applicable, the intervening ground</p>	Less than Significant

**TABLE S-3  
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES FOR THE INCENTIVE DISTRICT**

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance Determination after Mitigation
	<p>between equipment and structures would be considered for its soil properties for additional vibration attenuation.</p> <p>If the project-specific analysis determines that a project-specific significant impact could occur mitigation shall be required to reduce the impact to less than significant. Alternative construction methods and equipment that generate lower vibration levels shall be considered. Estimated construction vibration levels would be required to not to exceed the vibration threshold of human perception at inhabited buildings (0.1 in/sec PPV at the receptor). Field vibration measurement surveys of actual construction vibration would be considered, as determined to be required by the vibration specialist, as part of construction vibration compliance with the threshold.</p> <p>This requirement shall be implemented for all projects under the Incentive District (Administrative Approval, Development Plan Review, and Conditional Use Permit processing requirements as specified in Section 3901 of the Coast Highway Incentive District).</p>	
<p><b>Impact Incentive District NOI-2: Traffic Noise, Wisconsin Avenue between Freeman Street and Ditmar Street.</b> The potential increase in project-related future traffic noise levels (due primarily to redistribution of traffic volumes from lane reduction along the Coast Highway corridor) along the roadway segment of Wisconsin Avenue, between Freeman Street and Ditmar Street would result in a significant impact. In this location increases in traffic noise compared to the 2035 Future Without Project Condition is predicted to be as much as 6.0 dBA CNEL.</p>	<p>Because of the configuration of existing land uses in this area, these impacts could not be avoided with implementation of the project. Specifically, existing residential uses and the Saint Mary Star of the Sea School are using the roadway segment of Wisconsin Avenue between Freeman Street and Ditmar Street for access. Thus, the addition of sound walls or other attenuation approaches are not feasible in this location. As such, noise impacts would be significant and unavoidable along this roadway segment.</p>	<p>Significant and Unavoidable</p>
<p><b>Impact Incentive District NOI-3: Construction Noise.</b> Construction activities could substantially increase ambient noise levels at noise sensitive receptors (i.e., existing residences and schools) in proximity to the future construction activity at the potential development within the Incentive District. Construction noise would average approximately 80 dBA Leq at 100 feet from construction activities, which would temporarily increase existing ambient noise levels of approximately 65 dBA, by approximately 15 dBA Leq at existing residences to be located within the Incentive District. These impacts would be considered significant.</p>	<p><b>MM Incentive District NOI-2:</b> For individual development projects proposed under the Incentive District, the following field techniques shall be implemented by the project construction contractor to reduce construction-related noise at noise-sensitive receptors within 100 feet of construction activity:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Unless safety provisions require otherwise, the Incentive District construction contractor shall adjust all audible back-up alarms to the lowest volume appropriate for safety purposes (i.e., still maintaining adequate signal-to-noise ratio for alarm effectiveness). The contractor shall consider signal persons, strobe lights, or alternative safety equipment and/or processes as allowed, for reducing reliance on high-amplitude sonic alarms.</li> <li>b. The construction contractor shall place stationary noise sources at the construction site, such as generators and air compressors, as far away as possible from affected noise-sensitive receivers (residential and school uses). Non-noise-producing equipment, such as trailers, may be located as a sound</li> </ol>	<p>Significant and Unavoidable</p>

**TABLE S-3**  
**SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES FOR THE INCENTIVE DISTRICT**

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance Determination after Mitigation
	<p>barrier between suspected major noise-producing sources and sensitive receptors.</p> <p>c. Noise producing equipment (e.g., jackhammers and pavement breakers) shall use noise attenuating shields, shrouds, or portable barriers or enclosures, to reduce operating noise.</p> <p>d. Line or cover hoppers, storage bins, and chutes shall include sound-deadening material (e.g., apply wood or rubber liners to metal bin impact surfaces).</p> <p>e. To the extent practicable and available, the construction contractor shall use construction equipment manufactured or modified to reduce noise and vibration emissions, such as: electric instead of diesel-powered equipment, hydraulic tools instead of pneumatic tools, and electric saws instead of air- or gasoline-driven saws.</p> <p><b>MM Incentive District NOI-3:</b> Where feasible, temporary, field-erected noise barriers to block the line-of-site between construction equipment and sensitive receptors shall be installed prior to construction of the individual development projects under the Incentive District. Noise barriers could include sound blankets hanging on existing fences, or freestanding portable sound walls. Noise barriers should be a minimum of 8-feet in height and continuous between the source of noise and adjacent or nearby noise-sensitive receptors. Noise barriers are most effective when placed directly adjacent to either the noise source or receptor.</p> <p>Barrier construction may include, but not necessarily limited to, using appropriately thick wooden panel walls (at least one-half inch thick), as shown in Figure 3.10-2, which are tall enough to block the line-of-sight between the dominant construction noise source(s) and the noise-sensitive receptor. Such barriers can reduce construction noise by 5 to 15 dBA at nearby noise-sensitive receptor locations, depending on barrier height and length, and the distance between the barrier and the noise-producing equipment or activity. Alternatively, field-erected noise curtain assemblies could be installed around specific equipment sites or zones of anticipated mobile or stationary activity, resembling the sample shown in Figure 3.10-3. These techniques are most effective and practical when the construction activity noise source is stationary (e.g., auger or drill operation) and the specific source locations of noise emissions are near the ground and can be placed as close to the equipment/activity-facing side of the noise barrier as possible. Barrier layout and other implementation details would vary by construction site.</p> <p>MM Incentive District NOI-3 may not be feasible to implement at all locations at all times during construction activities, due to potential physical constraints at a location which do not block line-of sight between a noise source and a residence. For example, existing fences may not be tall enough or sturdy enough to support noise blankets being attached and the placement of temporary barriers could endanger construction crew members and equipment. Therefore, impacts would</p>	

**TABLE S-3  
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES FOR THE INCENTIVE DISTRICT**

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance Determination after Mitigation
<p><b>Impact Incentive District NOI-4: Contribution to Cumulative Traffic Noise.</b> Cumulative noise effects are determined by comparing existing conditions to future (2035) traffic noise levels with the project. Comparing these two scenarios, significant cumulative the threshold would be exceeded for two street segments: along Wisconsin Avenue, between Freeman Street and Ditmar Street (5.4 dBA, CNEL) and along Washington Avenue, west of Coast Highway (5.8 dBA, CNEL). Therefore, future noise levels in these specific locations would be cumulatively significant.</p> <p>The project's contribution to the cumulative noise impacts along roadway segments can be determined by comparing projected future (2035) traffic noise levels without the project to the future (2035) traffic noise levels with the project. The project's contribution to increases in future noise levels along Wisconsin Avenue between Freeman Street and Ditmar Street is predicted to be 6.0 dBA CNEL and the project's contribution to increases in future noise levels along Washington Avenue west of Coast Highway is predicted to be 3.8 dBA CNEL. In both locations, the project's contribution would be perceptible (greater than 3 dBA). Therefore, the project contributes considerably to the significant cumulative impacts for the future (2035) traffic noise conditions along these two street segments. This is considered a significant impact of the project.</p>	<p>be potentially significant and unavoidable with regard to a temporary substantial increase in ambient noise levels.</p> <p>Sound walls are often used to address roadway noise impacts. However, due to the need for access points (for example, driveways to residences and street access to the Saint Mary Star of the Sea School), a wall could not be continuous and would not effectively shield the noise-sensitive uses from the roadway noise. In addition, the addition of sound walls would not be desirable as they would detract from the community character and visual quality of these neighborhoods. For these reasons, the addition of continuous sound walls to address these identified impacts would not be desirable or feasible. No other effective mitigation approaches are available. For these reasons, the project's contribution to cumulative noise impacts along Wisconsin Avenue (between Freeman Street and Ditmar Street) and Washington Avenue (west of Coast Highway) is considered cumulatively considerable and significant and unavoidable.</p>	<p>Significant and Unavoidable</p>
<p><b>Transportation and Traffic</b></p>	<p><b>MM Incentive District TR-1:</b> Prior to submittal of grading plans for development and redevelopment projects under the Incentive District that would result in temporary interferences along roadways within the project area, project applicants and/or private developers shall prepare a Traffic Control Plan for approval by the City Transportation Division. The Traffic Control Plan will show all signage, striping, delineated detours, flagging operations and any other devices that will be used during construction to guide motorists safely through the construction area and allow for adequate access and circulation to the satisfaction of the City. The Traffic Control Plan will be prepared in accordance with the City's traffic control guidelines and will be prepared to ensure that access will be maintained to individual properties, and that emergency access will not be restricted. The Traffic Control Plan will ensure that congestion and traffic delay are not substantially increased as a result of the construction activities. In addition, the project applicants and/or</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>

**TABLE S-3**  
**SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES FOR THE INCENTIVE DISTRICT**

<b>Environmental Impact</b>	<b>Mitigation Measures</b>	<b>Significance Determination after Mitigation</b>
interferences and impacts to emergency access, including during an evacuation, creating a potentially significant impact.	<p>private developers shall provide written notice at least 2 weeks prior to the start of construction to owners/occupants along streets to be affected during construction.</p> <p>During construction, continuous vehicular and pedestrian access to residential driveways from the public street to the private property line will be maintained, except where necessary construction precludes such continuous access for reasonable periods of time. Access will be reestablished at the end of the workday. If a driveway needs to be closed or interfered with as described above, the project applicants and/or private developers shall notify the owner or occupant of the closure of the driveway at least 5 working days prior to the closure. The Traffic Control Plan shall include provisions to ensure that the construction does not interfere unnecessarily with the work of other agencies such as emergency service providers, mail delivery, school buses, and municipal waste services.</p>	

## **S.7 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Recommended Mitigation Measures – Alternative 1 through Alternative 3**

As noted in Section S.3, the alternatives analysis contained in Chapter 5 includes a detailed analysis of the potential environmental impacts that would result with implementation of Alternative 1, Alternative 2, and Alternative 3. The analysis contained in Chapter 5 is more detailed than that required by CEQA for an alternatives analysis and, as such, provides the analysis necessary for the City of Oceanside to adopt either of these three alternatives as their preferred alternative, should they so choose.

The mitigation measures necessary for implementation of Alternative 1, Alternative 2, and Alternative 3 would be identical to the mitigation measures required for the proposed project, with the exception of two measures: MM Complete Streets TR-1 and MM Complete Streets TR-2.

**Table S-4** provides the modifications to MM Complete Streets TR-1 and MM Complete Streets TR-2 that would be necessary for adoption of either Alternative 1 Alternative 2, and Alternative 3.

**TABLE S-4  
SUMMARY OF TRAFFIC IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES FOR ALTERNATIVE 1 AND ALTERNATIVE 2**

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance Determination after Mitigation																												
<p><i>If the City of Oceanside determines a preference for either Alternative 1 or Alternative 2 or Alternative 3, all of the mitigation measures provided in Tables S-2 and S-3 would be required with the modification of replacing MM Complete Streets TR-1 and MM Complete Streets TR-2 with the mitigation measures that follow. The transportation and traffic impacts for Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 would be similar. For this reason, the required traffic mitigation measures would be the same for both alternatives. Alternative 3 would have different transportation and traffic impacts than the proposed project and Alternative 1 and 2.</i></p>																														
<p><b>Alternatives 1 and 2</b></p>																														
<p><b>Impact Complete Streets TR-1: Existing + Project Traffic Conditions.</b> Under the Existing + Alternative 1 and the Existing + Alternative 2 scenarios, implementation of the modified Complete Streets improvements would not cause any of the study area intersections to operate at an unacceptable LOS (LOS E or LOS F). Therefore, implementation of either Alternative 1 or Alternative 2 would avoid this impact when compared to the proposed project.</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>																												
<p><b>Impact Complete Streets TR-2: Future 2035 Traffic Conditions.</b> Under the Future 2035 Conditions + Alternative 1 and the Future 2035 Conditions + Alternative 2 scenario, implementation of the modified Complete Streets improvements would cause the following study area intersections to operate at a deficient LOS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6. Coast Highway &amp; Pier View Way</li> <li>15. Seagaze Street and Ditmar Street</li> <li>21. Coast Highway and Wisconsin Avenue</li> <li>42. Vista Way and Ditmar Street</li> <li>47. Coast Highway &amp; Kelly Street</li> <li>52. Oceanside Boulevard &amp; I-5 Southbound On-/Off-Ramps</li> <li>56. Vista Way &amp; I-5 Southbound On-/Off-Ramps</li> </ul> <p>With implementation of either Alternative 1 or Alternative 2, impacts would occur to 53 fewer intersections when compared to the proposed project.</p>	<p><b>MM Complete Streets TR-2:</b> In order to mitigate the deficient LOS at five of the degraded study area intersections predicted under the Future + Alternatives scenarios, the City shall implement the following measures to improve intersection operations. The City shall complete the improvements either prior to or concurrent with the Complete Streets improvements. The specific measures for the three degraded study intersections in the Future + Alternative scenarios are as follows:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="882 899 1612 1427"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2"></th> <th colspan="2" style="text-align: center;"><b>Mitigated Conditions</b></th> </tr> <tr> <th colspan="2" style="text-align: center;"><b>Measure</b></th> <th style="text-align: center;"><b>Delay (sec/vehicle)</b></th> <th style="text-align: center;"><b>LOS</b></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">6</td> <td>Maintain Existing Traffic Signal</td> <td style="text-align: center;">8.7</td> <td style="text-align: center;">A</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">15</td> <td>Convert AWSC to Traffic Signal</td> <td style="text-align: center;">13.20</td> <td style="text-align: center;">B</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">42</td> <td>Convert SSSC to Traffic Signal</td> <td style="text-align: center;">18.3</td> <td style="text-align: center;">B</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">47</td> <td>Convert SSSC to Traffic Signal and restripe eastbound /westbound right turn into a shared left thru-right</td> <td style="text-align: center;">5.8</td> <td style="text-align: center;">A</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">52 (AM Peak Hour)</td> <td>Southbound configuration will include two left turn lanes and a shared thru-right lane with a storage length of 100 feet</td> <td style="text-align: center;">33.9</td> <td style="text-align: center;">C</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			<b>Mitigated Conditions</b>		<b>Measure</b>		<b>Delay (sec/vehicle)</b>	<b>LOS</b>	6	Maintain Existing Traffic Signal	8.7	A	15	Convert AWSC to Traffic Signal	13.20	B	42	Convert SSSC to Traffic Signal	18.3	B	47	Convert SSSC to Traffic Signal and restripe eastbound /westbound right turn into a shared left thru-right	5.8	A	52 (AM Peak Hour)	Southbound configuration will include two left turn lanes and a shared thru-right lane with a storage length of 100 feet	33.9	C	<p>Significant and Unavoidable</p>
		<b>Mitigated Conditions</b>																												
<b>Measure</b>		<b>Delay (sec/vehicle)</b>	<b>LOS</b>																											
6	Maintain Existing Traffic Signal	8.7	A																											
15	Convert AWSC to Traffic Signal	13.20	B																											
42	Convert SSSC to Traffic Signal	18.3	B																											
47	Convert SSSC to Traffic Signal and restripe eastbound /westbound right turn into a shared left thru-right	5.8	A																											
52 (AM Peak Hour)	Southbound configuration will include two left turn lanes and a shared thru-right lane with a storage length of 100 feet	33.9	C																											

**TABLE S-4  
SUMMARY OF TRAFFIC IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES FOR ALTERNATIVE 1 AND ALTERNATIVE 2**

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance Determination after Mitigation
	52 (PM Peak Hour) Southbound configuration will include two left turn lanes and a shared thru-right lane with a storage length of 100 feet	44.2 D <sup>1</sup>
	Notes:  <sup>1</sup> Under the Future Conditions without Alternative 1 scenario, Intersection 52 (PM Peak-Hour) would operate at LOS C. Under the Future Conditions + Alternative 1 and 2 scenarios, this intersection would be degraded to LOS D, which is considered a significant impact under Caltrans guidelines. While the mitigation measure would reduce delay by 1.8 seconds, this intersection would still operate at LOS D and remain deficient.	
	Similar to the proposed project, while feasible mitigation measures are available to mitigate the impacts at these three intersections, there are no feasible mitigation measures that would reduce project impacts to a less than significant level at the following three intersections:	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>21. Coast Highway &amp; Wisconsin Avenue</li> <li>52. Oceanside Boulevard &amp; I-5 Southbound On-/Off-Ramps (PM peak-hour)</li> <li>56. Vista Way &amp; I-5 Southbound On-/Off-Ramps</li> </ul>	
	In order to reduce significant impacts to Coast Highway and Wisconsin Avenue the capacity of the single-lane roundabout would need to be increased to a two-lane roundabout. However, the mid-corridor intersection at Coast Highway and Wisconsin Avenue has limited right-of-way, which prevents the installation of a two-lane roundabout. Further, a signalized intersection is also not a viable mitigation measure as this intersection is integral to the continuity of the Complete Streets improvements throughout the corridor. For these reasons, project impacts to the intersection of Coast Highway and Wisconsin Avenue would remain significant and unavoidable.	
	In order to address impacts to Oceanside Boulevard and I-5 Southbound On-/Off-Ramps (PM Peak-Hour) (Intersection 52) to an operating condition that is less than significant under the Future Conditions + Alternatives 1 and 2 scenarios, lane modifications would be required to construct new through traffic lanes on Oceanside Boulevard at this location. This type of improvement was determined to be infeasible due to the proximity of the roadway to the adjacent Sprinter rail tracks to the south and the proximity of the intersection to the I-5 overpass above Oceanside Boulevard. The roadway right-of-way below the freeway overpass is very constrained and would not accommodate roadway widening. While the intersection is forecast to operate at a deficient level of service per Caltrans guidelines, the intersection conditions would not cause significant queuing of	

**TABLE S-4**  
**SUMMARY OF TRAFFIC IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES FOR ALTERNATIVE 1 AND ALTERNATIVE 2**

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance Determination after Mitigation
	<p>vehicles on the southbound off-ramp and would not impact mainline traffic conditions on I-5. For these reasons, project impacts to the intersection of Oceanside Boulevard and I-5 Southbound On-/Off-Ramps (PM Peak-Hour) would remain significant and unavoidable under the Future Conditions + Alternatives 1 and 2 scenarios.</p> <p>In order to address impacts to Vista Way and I-5 Southbound On-/Off-Ramps (Intersection 56) to an operating condition that is less than significant under the Future Conditions + Alternatives 1 and 2 scenarios, lane modifications would be required to construct new through traffic lanes in either the westbound or eastbound directions on Vista Way/SR-78. The addition of a westbound through lane at this location was determined to be infeasible due to the limited right-of-way available on Vista Way west of the intersection. Furthermore, with the recent road diet installed by the City along Vista Way east of this intersection, lane modifications would be inconsistent with the vision and goals of the City. Moreover, the addition of an eastbound through lane was also found to be infeasible. The configuration of the traffic lanes and bridge to the east of the intersection is not compatible with three eastbound through lanes on Vista Way. Caltrans and SANDAG have plans to reconfigure the I-5/SR-78/Vista Way interchange in the future, where the proposed reconfiguration would address the significant traffic impact identified for the intersection at Vista Way and I-5 Southbound On/Off Ramp. However, while this is currently in Caltrans and SANDAG's long-term plans, funding is not guaranteed with enough certainty to include the improvements in a CEQA-required future analysis scenario. Therefore, project impacts to the intersection of Vista Way and I-5 Southbound On/Off Ramps would remain significant and unavoidable under the Future Conditions + Alternatives 1 and 2 scenarios.</p>	
<b>Alternative 3</b>		
<p><b>Impact Complete Streets TR-1: Existing + Alternative 3 Traffic Conditions.</b> Under the Existing + Alternative 3 scenario, implementation of the modified Complete Streets improvements would not cause any of the study area intersections to operate at a deficient LOS. Therefore, implementation of Alternative 3 would avoid this impact when compared to the proposed project.</p>	N/A	N/A
<p><b>Impact Complete Streets TR-2: Future 2035 Traffic Conditions.</b> Under the Future 2035 Conditions + Alternative 3 scenario, implementation of the modified Complete Streets improvements would cause the following study area intersections to operate at a deficient LOS:</p> <p>6. Coast Highway &amp; Pier View Way</p>	<p><b>MM Complete Streets TR-2:</b> In order to mitigate the deficient LOS at three of the degraded study area intersections predicted under the Future + Alternative 3 scenario, the City shall implement the following measures to improve intersection operations. The City shall complete the improvements either prior to or concurrent with the Complete Streets improvements. The specific measures for the three degraded study intersections in the Future + Alternative 3 scenario are as follows:</p>	Significant and Unavoidable

**TABLE S-4  
SUMMARY OF TRAFFIC IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES FOR ALTERNATIVE 1 AND ALTERNATIVE 2**

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Mitigated Conditions		Significance Determination after Mitigation
		Delay (sec/vehicle)	LOS	
15. Seagaze Street and Ditmar Street 21. Coast Highway and Wisconsin Avenue 24. Wisconsin Boulevard & Ditmar Street (South) 52. Oceanside Boulevard & I-5 Southbound On-/Off-Ramps				
With implementation of Alternative 3, impacts would occur to five fewer intersections when compared to the proposed project.	<b>Measure</b> 6 Maintain Existing Traffic Signal	12.4	B	
	15 Convert AWSC to Traffic Signal	7.1	A	
	52 (AM Peak Hour) Southbound configuration will include two left turn lanes and a shared thru-right lane with a storage length of 100 feet	30.7	C	
	52 (PM Peak Hour) Southbound configuration will include two left turn lanes and a shared thru-right lane with a storage length of 100 feet	42.4	D <sup>1</sup>	

---

**Notes:**

<sup>1</sup> Under the Future Conditions without Alternative 3 scenario, Intersection 52 (PM Peak-Hour) would operate at LOS C. Under the Future Conditions + Alternative 1 scenario, this intersection would be degraded to LOS D, which is considered a significant impact under Caltrans guidelines. While the mitigation measure would reduce delay by 1.8 seconds, this intersection would still operate at LOS D and remain deficient.

---

However, there is no feasible mitigation to increase LOS to conditions better than the threshold of significance at the following three study intersections under the Future Conditions + Alternative 3 scenario:

- 21. Coast Highway & Wisconsin Avenue
- 24. Wisconsin Boulevard & Ditmar Street (South)
- 52. Oceanside Boulevard & I-5 Southbound On/Off Ramps

In order to address impacts to Coast Highway and Wisconsin Avenue (Intersection 21) to an operating condition that is less than significant under the Future Conditions + Alternative 3 scenario, the capacity of the single-lane roundabout would need to be increased to a two-lane roundabout. However, the mid-corridor intersection at Coast Highway and Wisconsin Avenue has limited right-of-way, which prevents the installation of a two-lane roundabout. Further, a signalized intersection is also not a viable solution as this intersection is integral to the continuity of the Complete Streets improvements throughout the corridor. For these reasons, project impacts to the intersection of Coast Highway and Wisconsin Avenue would remain significant and unavoidable under the Future Conditions + Alternative 3 scenario.

In order to address impacts to Wisconsin Avenue and Ditmar Street (Intersection 24) to an operating condition that is less than significant under the Future Conditions + Alternative 3 scenario intersection, implementation of a traffic signal could mitigate the traffic impact. However, the conversion of this intersection into a traffic signal control would not be realistic due to the location of the intersection as it is in a residential area. Furthermore, the intersection does not meet signal warrants in the future condition. For these reasons, project impacts to the intersection of Wisconsin Avenue and Ditmar Street would remain significant and unavoidable under the Future Conditions + Alternative 3 scenario.

In order to address impacts to Oceanside Boulevard and I-5 Southbound On-/Off-Ramps (PM Peak-Hour) (Intersection 52) to an operating condition that is less than significant under the Future Conditions + Alternative 3 scenario, lane modifications would be required to construct new through traffic lanes on Oceanside Boulevard at this location. This type of improvement was determined to be infeasible due to the proximity of the roadway to the adjacent Sprinter rail tracks to the south and the proximity of the intersection to the I-5 overpass above Oceanside Boulevard. The roadway right-of-way below the freeway overpass is very constrained and would not accommodate

---

**TABLE S-4**  
**SUMMARY OF TRAFFIC IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES FOR ALTERNATIVE 1 AND ALTERNATIVE 2**

---

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance Determination after Mitigation
	<p>roadway widening. While the intersection is forecast to operate at a deficient level of service per Caltrans guidelines, the intersection conditions would not cause significant queuing of vehicles on the southbound off-ramp and would not impact mainline traffic conditions on I-5. For these reasons, project impacts to the intersection of Oceanside Boulevard and I-5 Southbound On-/Off-Ramps (PM Peak-Hour) would remain significant and unavoidable under the Future Conditions + Alternative 3 scenario.</p>	