

CHAPTER 4

Cumulative Impacts

This chapter presents an analysis of the effects of the proposed City of Oceanside Coast Highway Corridor Study Project in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects within the project area and surrounding area that could cause related environmental impacts similar to those anticipated to occur under the proposed project and discussed in this Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR). The focus of this cumulative impacts analysis is on the proposed project, including the Complete Streets improvements and Incentive District, and the geographic context appropriate for each resource area.

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15130 requires that an EIR discuss cumulative impacts of a project when the project's incremental effect is "cumulatively considerable." "Cumulative impacts" are defined as "two or more individual effects which, when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts." (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15355; see also Pub. Resources Code, Section 21083 (b).) Stated another way, "a cumulative impact consists of an impact which is created as a result of the combination of the project evaluated in the EIR together with other projects causing related impacts." (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15130 [a][1]) The definition of cumulatively considerable is provided in Section 15065(a)(3):

"Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of an individual project are significant when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.

According to Section 15130(b) of the CEQA Guidelines:

[t]he discussion of cumulative impacts shall reflect the severity of the impacts and their likelihood of occurrence, but the discussion need not provide as great detail as is provided for the effects attributable to the project alone. The discussion should be guided by standards of practicality and reasonableness, and should focus on the cumulative impact to which the identified other projects contribute rather than the attributes of other projects which do not contribute to the cumulative impact.

For purposes of this EIR, the proposed project would cause a cumulatively considerable and therefore significant cumulative impact if:

- The cumulative effects of other past, current, and probable future projects without the project are not significant and the project's incremental impact is substantial enough, when added to the cumulative effects, to result in a significant impact; or
- The cumulative effects of other past, current, and probable future projects without the project are already significant and the project would result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to the already significant effect. The standards used herein to determine whether the contribution is cumulatively considerable include the existing baseline environmental conditions, and whether the project would cause a substantial increase in impacts, or otherwise exceed an established threshold of significance.

4.1 Cumulative Projects

This analysis considers the impacts of the proposed project in combination with the potential environmental effects of other projects in the general area. "Other projects," also referred to as "cumulative projects," include recently completed projects, projects currently under construction, and future projects currently in development. The potential for projects to have a cumulative impact depends on both geographic location and the project schedule.

Geographic Scope

The geographic area affected by the proposed project and its potential to contribute to cumulative impacts varies based on the environmental resource under consideration. Generally, the geographic area associated with the environmental effects of the project as described in Chapter 2 define the boundaries of the area used for compiling the list of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future related projects considered in the cumulative impact analysis. **Table 4-1** presents the geographic areas included within this analysis for purposes of determining whether the proposed project's contribution to a particular impact would be cumulatively considerable and therefore significant.

Project Timing

In addition to the geographic scope, cumulative impacts are determined by the timing of the other projects relative to the proposed project. As noted above, projects considered in this analysis include those that have recently been completed, are currently under construction, or are in the planning stages. Schedule is particularly relevant to the consideration of cumulative construction-related impacts, since construction impacts tend to be relatively short term. However, for future projects, construction schedules are often broadly estimated and can change. Although the timing of the future projects is likely to fluctuate due to schedule changes or other unknown factors, this analysis assumes these individual projects would be developed for implementation through the course of the current planning horizon and could be implemented concurrently with construction of the proposed project. The Complete Streets improvements would be fully developed by 2035. The projects projected to occur under the Incentive District zone have been estimated through 2035. Therefore, 2035 is the planning horizon for this cumulative analysis.

TABLE 4-1
GEOGRAPHIC SCOPE OF CUMULATIVE IMPACTS ANALYSIS

Resource Issue	Geographic Scope
Aesthetics	Project site and areas immediately adjacent
Air Quality	San Diego Air Basin
Biological Resources	Project site and areas immediately adjacent
Cultural Resources	Coastal zone of northern San Diego County (roughly between La Jolla on the south, San Onofre on the north, and inland several miles to the foothills of the Peninsular Range)
Geology and Soils	Project site and areas immediately adjacent
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Global
Hazardous Materials	Project site and areas immediately adjacent
Hydrology and Water Quality	Carlsbad and San Luis Rey Hydrologic Units, the City of Oceanside, California, and the Mission sub-basin of the San Luis Rey Valley Groundwater Basin
Land Use and Planning	City of Oceanside, California
Noise	Project site and areas immediately adjacent
Population and Housing	City of Oceanside, California
Public Services	City of Oceanside, California
Recreation	City of Oceanside, California
Transportation and Traffic	Traffic Impact Analysis Study Area (shown in Figure 3.14-1)
Utilities and Service Systems	City of Oceanside, California

**TABLE 4-2
CUMULATIVE PROJECTS WITHIN THE PROJECT AREA**

Reference Number	Project Name	Project Location	Project Type	Project Description	Status
1	Hyatt Place	APN: 1430404100	Commercial	120-Unit Hotel 11,800 sf Restaurant	Entitled
2	Cleveland St. Beach Lofts	314 N. Cleveland St.	Mixed-Use	2,000 sf Office and Retail 10 Condo Units	Entitled
3	Portola	303 Pier View Way	Residential	15 Residential Condos 7 Live/Work Units	Entitled
4	The Belvedere	902 Seagaze Dr.	Mixed-Use	124-Room Hotel, 90 Live/Work Lofts, 8,357 sf Retail	Entitled
5	Oceanside Beach Resort	Pier View Way and Pacific St.	Commercial	389-Unit Hotel, 18,500 sf Visitor Commercial 20,000 sf Multifunctional Space	Entitled
6	GF Properties Mixed-Use Project Block 5	APN: 1473700400	Mixed-Use	35 Residential Units 1,602 sf Retail	Entitled
7	GF Properties Mixed-Use Project Block 18	APN: 1473700300	Mixed-Use	66 Residential Units 10,563 sf Retail	Under Construction
8	GF Properties Mixed-Use Project Block 19	APN: 1473700400	Mixed-Use	101 Residential Units 12,340 sf Retail	Entitled
9	GF Properties Mixed-Use Project Block 20	APN: 1473700400	Mixed-Use	29 Residential Units 15,057 sf Retail	Entitled
10	Seacliff Terraces	APN: 14304023 and 14304054	Mixed-Use	52 Residential Units Underground Parking Garage (122 spaces) 1,056 sf Retail	Entitled
11	Cleveland St. Townhomes	414 S. Cleveland	Residential	8 Residential Units	Under Construction
12	Breeze Luxury Apartments	APN: 152-121-06, 152-123-05, 152-123-20, 152-320-11	Residential	90 Residential Units 2 levels of underground parking	Under Review
13	Pacific Terrace	514 Morse St.	Residential	32 Residential Condos	Under Construction
14	Vine St. Collection	APN: 152-320-40	Residential	58 Townhome Units	Entitled
15	508 N. Tremont Condos	508 N. Tremont	Residential	3 Residential Condos	Entitled
16	519 S. Myers Condos	519 S. Myers	Residential	4 Residential Condos	Entitled

Reference Number	Project Name	Project Location	Project Type	Project Description	Status
17	206 S. Pacific Residence	206 S. Pacific	Residential	Replace 3 apartment units with 1 new 5,000 sf SFD	Entitled
18	Weitzel Apartments	402 Weitzel	Residential	32 Affordable Apartment Units	Entitled
19	Myers 12	1909 S Myers St.	Residential	12 Single-Family Attached Units with Off-Street Parking	Under Review
20	150 S. Myers Condos	150 S. Myers	Residential	4 Residential Condos	Under Review
21	910 S. Tremont	910 S. Tremont	Mixed-Use	5 Units with 1 Live/Work Unit	Under Review
22	1213 S. Nevada St. Apartments	1213 S. Nevada St.	Residential	3 Residential Condos	Entitled
23	829 S. Pacific Condos	829 S. Pacific	Residential	2 Residential Condos	Under Review
24	624 N. Coast Hwy.	624 N. Coast Hwy	Commercial	3,720 sf Commercial Space	Under Review
25	Coast Highway Bridge	San Luis Rey River	Bridge Replacement	Replace existing structure	EIR in process
26	Villa Capri	1002 Costa Pacifica Way	Residential	3 Residential Condos	Entitled
27	308 N. Tremont	308 N. Tremont St.	Residential	3 Residential Condos	Pending Application
28	Fraser & Covell	378 Sportfisher Dr.	Residential	4 Single-Family Row Homes	Entitled
29	Hayek	405 N. Tremont	Residential	2 Units	Entitled
30	SDG&E Substation	Civic Center Dr. and Tremont St.	Utility	Utility Substation	Pending Application
31	Japanese Craft Brewery	Mission Ave., between Tremont St. and Cleveland St.	Commercial	Brewery	Pending Application
32	Chapman Condos	416 S. Meyers St.	Residential	2 Residential Condos	Entitled
33	523 S. Meyers	523 S. Meyers St.	Residential	7 Residential Condos	Entitled
34	602 S. Meyers	602 S. Meyers St.	Residential	2 Residential Condos	Under Construction
35	502 S. The Strand	502 S. The Strand	Residential	2 Single-Family Units	Under Construction
36	412 S. The Strand	412 S. The Strand	Residential	4 Residential Condos	Entitled
37	Pack Duplex	312 S. The Strand	Residential	2 Residential Condos	Entitled
38	217 S. Pacific St.	217 S. Pacific St.	Residential	2 Residential Condos	Entitled
39	218 S. The Strand	218 S. The Strand	Residential	2 Residential Condos	Entitled
40	North Beach Promenade – Lot 23	Cleveland St., between Civic Center Dr. and Pier View Way	Mixed-use	10,000 sf Retail 52 Residential Units 357 Parking Spaces	Entitled

Reference Number	Project Name	Project Location	Project Type	Project Description	Status
41	Windward Way	Windward Way and Meyers St.	Residential	3 Single-Family Homes	Entitled
42	Stone Terrace	724 N. Pacific St	Residential	4 Units	Entitled
43	Tin Fish Restaurant Patio	302 The Strand	Commercial	Patio Repairs	Pending Application

Type of Projects Considered

As described in Chapter 3 of this EIR, the proposed project would cause near- and long-term impacts, as the proposed project would include the phased construction and operation of the Complete Streets improvements as well as future construction and operational activities associated with the development and redevelopment enabled by the Incentive District. **Figure 4-1** shows the locations of the cumulative projects within the vicinity of the project area. **Table 4-2** lists current and proposed projects that could potentially contribute to cumulative impacts within the project area. As the specific projects that could be proposed in the long term are unknown at this time, long-term cumulative impacts were addressed qualitatively assuming development would occur in accordance with the City's General Plan and Zoning Ordinance.

4.2 Description of Cumulative Effects

Aesthetics

The geographic context for the analysis of cumulative impacts in regard to scenic vistas and scenic resources within a designated state scenic highway is defined as the project area and its immediate vicinity. A significant cumulative impact would occur if the project would significantly contribute to a reduction in quality of scenic vistas, or scenic resources within a designated state scenic highway. While there are 24 cumulative projects that would occur within or adjacent to Coast Highway (including commercial, mixed-use, and residential projects), operation of new or expanded development would not occur within Coast Highway's right-of-way. Thus, cumulative development, along with the proposed project, would not block existing public scenic views within the viewshed of the project of the Pacific Ocean, San Luis Rey River, Buena Vista Lagoon, Oceanside Harbor, or Oceanside Pier. The nearest designated state scenic highway is located over 30 miles from the project area, and therefore no cumulative or project impacts would occur to scenic resources within a designated state scenic highway. No cumulative impacts would occur related to scenic vistas and scenic resources within a designated state scenic highway.

The geographic context for the analysis of cumulative impacts with regard to visual character and quality consists of the project area and its immediate vicinity. A significant cumulative impact would occur if the project would significantly contribute to a cumulative impact to the overall visual character of the area. As shown in Table 4-2, cumulative development in the project's vicinity would include restaurants, hotels, and residential units, which would have the potential to change the visual character of the area. While the Incentive District could increase density and heights of buildings within some planning areas, future developments would include higher architecture and design standards, and the setting and character of the site and surrounding areas would not be substantially degraded. The quality of the visual character of the Incentive District would increase due to higher architectural and design standards. In addition, all future development would be required to comply with the City's Municipal Code, Local Coastal Program, and General Plan policies. Therefore, the proposed project, in conjunction with other cumulative projects, would not result in cumulative impacts related to visual character and quality.

The geographic context for analysis of cumulative impacts in regard to lighting and glare is the city of Oceanside. A significant cumulative impact related to aesthetics would occur if the cumulative projects would create new sources of substantial light and glare adversely affecting day- or nighttime views. The approved or planned cumulative development in the project's vicinity would include restaurants, hotels, and residential units, which would have the potential to create light and glare without the proposed project. The proposed project could contribute new sources of lighting from streetlights or glare from building materials, such as windows. However, the Incentive District would include design standards to minimize the proposed project's contribution to nighttime lighting. Project compliance and compatibility with the Municipal Code would limit the amount of unnecessary exterior illumination and glare. Similar to the proposed project, the cumulative projects would be required to comply with the city's existing regulations to minimize nighttime lighting. Therefore, a significant cumulative impact related to glare and lighting would not occur.

Significance Determination: Less than significant

Air Quality

This cumulative impacts section provides a cumulative impact analysis of the entire project (Complete Streets improvements and the Incentive District) separately for project construction and project operation. Construction and operation of the entire project would include future development projects that have not yet been proposed. Since the City has no control over the timing or sequencing of the cumulative projects, any quantitative analysis to ascertain daily construction emissions that assumes multiple, concurrent construction future development projects would be speculative. For this reason, the methodology to assess a project's cumulative impact differs from the cumulative impacts methodology employed for other environmental issue areas. For air quality, project-specific air quality significance thresholds are used to determine potential cumulative impacts to regional air quality.

The geographic scope for potential cumulative air quality impacts consists of the San Diego Air Basin (SDAB). The project would result in the emission of criteria pollutants during construction of the Complete Streets improvements and the development of the Incentive District. Based on the project-specific level of emissions, the project's cumulative impacts would be potentially significant because its maximum daily construction emissions could potentially exceed the SDAPCD screening level thresholds for maximum daily emissions. As detailed information regarding individual development projects within the Incentive District is not currently available, it cannot be determined with certainty that MM Incentive District AIR-1a through AIR-1c would reduce construction emissions from future development that could occur as a result of adoption of the Incentive District to a less than significant level. Additional feasible measures cannot be developed without knowing the exact timing or location of the construction projects. Because there is no way to accurately predict the intensity of construction associated with the Incentive District or the construction timing, this impact is considered cumulatively significant and unavoidable.

This page left intentionally blank

Similarly, there is no way to accurately predict the intensity or timing of construction associated with the entire project and other non-Incentive District projects. As a result, cumulative construction impacts with respect to non-Incentive District projects are also considered cumulatively significant and unavoidable.

Operation of the potential development projects under the Incentive District would result in mobile source emissions generated by vehicle trips from future development and population growth. Operation of the Complete Streets improvements is not expected to result directly in an increase in emissions and would therefore not contribute to cumulative impacts. Per capita operational emissions from development projects under the Incentive District are expected to decline in future years relative to existing conditions, in particular mobile source exhaust pollutants from vehicles (i.e., mobile source volatile organic compound, oxides of nitrogen, and carbon monoxide (CO) emissions), due to improved vehicle emission standards and fuel economy standards that have been adopted by the USEPA and State of California (i.e., emissions standards through vehicle model year 2025). Nonetheless, future development that could occur as a result of adoption of the Incentive District could result in an increase in the total amount of vehicle miles traveled due to increased overall density, which may result in an overall increase in mobile source emissions, despite the improved transportation efficiency and per capita emissions reductions expected from mobile sources meeting increasingly more stringent vehicle emissions standards.

As detailed information regarding individual development projects within the Incentive District is not currently available, it cannot be determined with certainty that 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 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 cumulatively significant and unavoidable.

Similarly, there is no way to accurately predict the intensity of development projects associated with the entire project and other non-Incentive District projects. As a result, cumulative operational impacts with respect to non-Incentive District projects are also considered cumulatively significant and unavoidable.

Significance Determination: Significant and unavoidable

Biological Resources

The Complete Streets improvements and the projects developed under the Incentive District may result in a minor loss of biological resources, such as the loss of nesting, foraging, and roosting habitat for migratory birds, raptors, and bats if trees or landscaping is removed. These impacts, when considered cumulatively with other past, present, and future projects within the region, are less than significant because of the developed nature of the Complete Streets improvements area and because ornamental vegetation and the urban/developed land cover type found within the Incentive District exists throughout the region and is of low value for biological resources.

Trees and landscaping within the area are ornamental and predominantly non-native. This type of vegetation and land cover type is abundant within the region and is of low value for biological resources relative to other habitat types; therefore, additional cumulative loss of this urban/developed land cover type would not be significant.

Indirect impacts to riparian habitats, sensitive natural communities, federally or state protected jurisdictional wetlands/waters, and wildlife movement corridors within the project area may occur. However, these impacts would not be cumulatively considerable given their indirect nature and the availability of mitigation measures that would be required to avoid impacts to riparian habitats, sensitive natural communities, federally or state protected jurisdictional wetlands/waters, and/or wildlife movement corridors.

The project would comply with the Multiple Habitat Conservation Program (MHCP) and City Subarea Plan which evaluate the local and regional value of biological resources on a regional level. Projects within the Incentive District and other projects within region would be subject to similar mitigation requirements, including no net loss to federally or state protected jurisdictional wetlands/waters, in accordance with the MHCP and City Subarea Plan.

The project area does not include any areas or habitats identified within these plans as locally or regionally important to biological resources. Increases in development and density within the project area would also have the potential to decrease development pressure in undeveloped areas outside of the project area that may have higher biological value, resulting in an overall beneficial impact to biological resources. For these reasons, the Incentive District would not contribute considerably to any negative cumulative impact to regionally important biological resources identified by the MHCP and the City's Subarea Plan.

Significance Determination: Less than significant

Cultural Resources

This analysis of cumulative impacts takes into consideration impacts on cultural and paleontological resources from implementation of both the Complete Streets improvements and any future projects within the Incentive District project area. The geographic area of analysis for cultural resources typically covers the region within which similar types of cultural and paleontological resources occur. In this case, the geographic scope of analysis encompasses the broadly defined coastal zone of northern San Diego County, roughly between La Jolla on the south, San Onofre on the north, and inland several miles to the foothills of the Peninsular Range. Prehistoric groups occupying this area focused to a large degree on littoral settings, particularly those associated with the estuaries at the mouths of the coastal drainages. A focus on coastal resources in these estuaries created archaeological patterns somewhat distinct from those of the county's southern coast and inland areas. A similar scope of analysis would be appropriate for paleontological resources, given the presence throughout the coastal zone of similar geological formations. This geographic scope of analysis is appropriate because the archaeological, historical, tribal, and paleontological resources within this area are expected to be similar to those that occur within the project area.

Multiple projects, mostly residential and mixed-use residential and commercial development, are proposed throughout the geographic scope of analysis, as shown in Table 4-2. Cumulative impacts to cultural resources could occur if any of these projects, in conjunction with the proposed project, would have impacts on resources that, when considered together, would be significant. However, the current projects would not affect any known cultural resources, including archaeological resources, historical-period built resources, tribal cultural resources, or human remains. While there is the potential for impacts to unknown cultural resources, such as those that might be discovered during ground disturbing activities during project implementation, MM Complete Streets CR-1 through CR-9 would ensure that impacts are reduced to less than significant. For the Incentive District portion of the project, which covers future projects within the Incentive District area, additional studies, as outlined in MM Incentive District CR-1 and CR-2, would be required prior project implementation. If any resources are identified within those project areas, mitigation measures would be developed to reduce impacts to less than significant. Taken together, implementation of these mitigation measures would ensure that the project would not have a cumulative impact on cultural resources.

Regarding paleontological resources, activities associated with the Complete Streets improvements do not have the potential to impact paleontological resources. The Complete Streets improvements would not contribute to cumulatively considerable impacts to paleontological resources. In regard to future projects that could occur under the Incentive District, excavation activities within the Incentive District area, in conjunction with other projects in the area, could contribute to the progressive loss of paleontological resources, as-yet unrecorded fossil sites, associated geological and geographic data, and fossil-bearing strata. However, for any future development and redevelopment project in the Incentive District area, MM Incentive District CR-3 requires appropriate studies to identify the potential for paleontological resources, and the development of appropriate mitigation to reduce impacts to paleontological resources. Given this, MM Incentive District CR-3 would ensure that cumulative impacts to paleontological resources would be less than significant.

Significance Determination: Less than significant

Geology, Soils, and Seismicity

Although the Oceanside area is located within a seismically active region with a wide range of geologic and soil conditions, these conditions can vary greatly within a short distance. Accordingly, geologic, soils, and seismic impacts tend to be site-specific and depend on the local geology and soil conditions. For these reasons, the geographic scope for potential cumulative geologic and seismic impacts consists of the project area and the immediate vicinity. Potential impacts related to geologic hazards in the project area are not additive with other cumulative projects and are therefore not cumulatively significant. Given the conditions within the project area, a hazardous geologic event at one site would not necessarily occur at or affect another. While a large landslide event could trigger other landslide events, the project area and surrounding off-site project area is relatively flat and would not contribute to a cumulatively significant impact. In addition, the proposed project and nearby cumulative projects would be required to comply with applicable provisions of the same laws and regulations. Through

compliance with these requirements, the potential for impacts would be reduced. As discussed in Section 3.5.2, the purpose of the California Building Code is to regulate and control the design, construction, quality of materials, use/occupancy, location, and maintenance of all buildings and structures within its jurisdiction; by design, it is intended to reduce the cumulative risks from buildings and structures. Therefore, based on compliance with these requirements, the incremental impacts of the proposed project combined with impacts of other projects in the area would not cause a significant cumulative impact related to seismic hazards, slope stability, or expansive soils.

The geographic context for the determination of cumulative impacts related to erosion or topsoil loss is also site-specific and limited to the project site and immediately adjacent areas. Future growth and redevelopment in the city could result in an increase in impermeable surfaces, alteration of drainage, and grading and clearance of vegetation. However, future development within the city would be required to comply with the City's Municipal Code (Chapter 6, Building Construction Regulations, and Chapter 40 Urban Runoff and Discharge Control), as well as regulations and policies associated with erosion or siltation, surface runoff, and adequate drainage capacity. Similar to the proposed project, cumulative projects would be required to be in compliance with the City's Grading Ordinance, Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) requirements, and, if greater than one acre, the Construction General Permit and Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). Thus, cumulative impacts related to erosion or topsoil loss would be less than significant.

Waste water disposal systems are also site-specific and not cumulative in nature. The proposed project would be served by the existing sewage system and would not include the installation of a septic system. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact regarding soils incapable of adequately supporting septic tanks, and the impact would not be cumulatively significant.

Significance Determination: Less than significant

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

With respect to emissions of GHGs, potential impacts to climate change from increases in GHG emission are uniquely cumulative in nature (CAPCOA 2008). The California Natural Resources Agency has clarified that the CEQA Guidelines amendments focus on the effects of GHG emissions as cumulative impacts, and that they should be analyzed in the context of CEQA's requirements for cumulative impact analysis (see Section 15064(h)(3)).¹ Therefore, the project-level analysis provided below serves as a cumulative impact assessment for GHG emissions.

Cumulative development of the entire project (Complete Streets improvements and the Incentive District) in the aggregate could 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 CO₂e

¹ See generally California Natural Resources Agency, Final Statement of Reasons for Regulatory Action (December 2009), pp. 11-13, 14, 16; see also Letter from Cynthia Bryant, Director of the Office of Planning and Research to Mike Chrisman, Secretary for Natural Resources, April 13, 2009, https://www.opr.ca.gov/docs/Transmittal_Letter.pdf, accessed December 2016.

(metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent) per year. Therefore, implementation of the Complete Streets improvements and Incentive District could result in significant GHG emissions. 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. Even with MM Incentive District AIR-2, the net increase in GHG emissions in the aggregate could exceed thresholds, and impacts are considered potentially cumulatively significant and unavoidable.

As the entire project would be considered potentially cumulatively significant and unavoidable, and since GHG impacts are exclusively cumulative in nature, operational impacts with respect to non-Incentive District projects are also considered potentially cumulatively significant and unavoidable.

Significance Determination: Significant and unavoidable

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The geographic scope of analysis for cumulative hazards and hazardous materials impacts encompasses the Complete Streets improvements and Incentive District areas, along with nearby areas that could affect soil and groundwater conditions that would result in a cumulative impact. Future development within the Incentive District area and surrounding areas could require the use, transport, storage, and disposal of hazardous materials. However, hazardous materials releases tend to be largely limited to a specific site, and cumulative impacts would only occur at adjacent or overlapping sites. More importantly, all cumulative projects would be required to comply with all relevant and applicable federal, state, and local laws and regulations that pertain to the transport, storage, and disposal of hazardous materials and waste. In the event of an accidental release of hazardous materials, containment and cleanup would be conducted in accordance with existing applicable regulatory requirements. Similar to the Complete Streets improvements and the Incentive District, each cumulative project would also be required to prepare and implement a Hazardous Materials Business Plan that would require that hazardous materials used for construction be stored in appropriate containers, with secondary containment to contain a potential release. The California Fire Code would require measures for the safe storage and handling of hazardous materials. Furthermore, if cumulative projects disturb 1 acre or more, the projects would be required to comply with the Construction General Permit, which requires a SWPPP and BMPs to prevent pollutants from being released. Therefore, impacts related to the routine use and accidental release of hazardous materials would not be cumulatively considerable.

Impacts related to school sites, listing on a hazardous materials site, surrounding airports, and wildland fires also tend to be site-specific and not cumulative in nature. Potential risks identified for the proposed project or on other cumulative project sites would not affect potential risks elsewhere in the city. Cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

A cumulative impact related to emergency evacuation plans would occur if development within the project area and surrounding developments in the city would not provide adequate access to regional evacuation routes. As described within Table 4-2, a cumulative project includes replacement of the Coast Highway Bridge over the San Luis Rey River, which, in combination with the proposed project, could contribute to a cumulative impact to regional evacuation routes. As described within Section 3.7, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, the proposed project would include interference within roads, including lane closures and slow-moving construction equipment. However, MM Complete Streets TR-3 and MM Incentive District TR-1 would require a traffic control plan for all anticipated lane closures, ensuring adequate emergency access to the project area and surrounding uses. Cumulative projects would also be required to implement traffic control plans if lane closures or restrictions are anticipated. Therefore, the proposed project's contribution to a cumulative emergency response and evacuation impact would be less than cumulatively considerable.

Significance Determination: Less than significant

Hydrology and Water Quality

The geographic scope of analysis for cumulative impacts related to water quality and erosion and siltation includes the Carlsbad and San Luis Rey Hydrologic Units. Future cumulative projects have the potential to discharge pollutants, including erosion and siltation, off site during construction and operational activities, which could further degrade the receiving waters within these two hydrologic units. As shown in Table 3.8-1, the three water bodies within the project area are listed on the SWRCB 303(d) list of impaired water bodies. All three of these water bodies are located in the coastal areas of the hydrologic units, where pollutants have been discharged either locally or have traveled downstream from upper portions of the hydrologic units. However, Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDL) for each of the listed pollutants have been established as a means to alleviate the impairments within the water bodies' surface water within a specific timeframe, which would improve overall conditions of impaired water bodies within the hydrologic units. Due to the conditions of the water bodies located within the project area, there is a significant cumulative impact to water quality.

The proposed project would comply with all applicable water quality regulations including but not limited to the Construction General Permit and SWPPP, City Municipal Code (Chapter 40 Urban Runoff and Discharge Control), SUSMP requirements, and the City's Grading Ordinance, which would reduce or eliminate the potential for pollutants to be discharged off site and into receiving waters. Therefore, the proposed project's contribution to the significant cumulative impact to water quality would not be cumulatively considerable.

The geographic scope of analysis for cumulative impacts related to surface runoff and drainage capacity is the city of Oceanside. The amount of surface runoff and the need for expanded storm drain facilities are directly related to the amount of impervious surface, which prevents runoff permeating the ground and increases the discharge rate. The city of Oceanside is urban and developed with impervious surfaces and has limited vacant parcels. Similar to the proposed project, future projects within the city would be either infill projects or redevelopment due to the

highly urbanized nature of the city. The amount of impervious surfaces would not substantially increase, as there is not a large quantity of vacant parcels that could be developed. In addition, similar to the project, future development would be required to incorporate low-impact development (LID) and operational best management practices (BMPs) as well as provide more open spaces and landscaping in the site design as a means to increase permeable surfaces. For these reasons, cumulative impacts associated with surface runoff and expansion of storm drain facilities would be less than significant.

The geographic scope of analysis for cumulative impacts related to groundwater recharge and supply is the Mission sub-basin of the San Luis Rey Valley Groundwater Basin. Future growth and redevelopment in the city could result in an increase in impermeable surfaces, which could reduce the amount of groundwater that infiltrates into the groundwater aquifer within the city. However, the Mission sub-basin is primarily developed, and future development and redevelopment would not substantially increase the amount of impervious surface within the sub-basin. Similar to the proposed project, future development and redevelopment within the Mission sub-basin would be required to undergo jurisdictional and CEQA review, which would allow the jurisdictions to control the rate of growth in accordance within the sub-basin's recharge rates and supply.

Future population growth within the city could increase demand on the City's groundwater supply as a source of drinking water. Similar to the proposed project, future development and redevelopment projects would be required to be consistent with the City's General Plan and also consistent with the population growth projected by the City's General Plan. Further, by tracking groundwater supply availability, it is reasonably assumed that the City of Oceanside would continue to keep pace with development growth within the city. Therefore, impacts related to groundwater supply and recharge would not be cumulatively considerable

The geographic scope of analysis for cumulative impacts related to flooding, dam and tsunami inundation, seiche, and mudflows is site-specific and not cumulative in nature. A hazardous geologic or hydrologic event at one site would not necessarily occur at or affect another. The proposed project would comply with all regulations and standards associated with flood, dam failure, and tsunami inundation hazards. There minimal potential for seiche to occur within the city's lagoons is such that there would not be a cumulative impact. While a large mudflow event could trigger other such events, the project area and surrounding off-site project area are relatively flat and would not contribute to a cumulatively significant impact. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact regarding inundation hazards, seiche, and mudflows, and impacts would not be cumulatively significant.

Significance Determination: Less than significant

Land Use and Planning

The geographic context for the analysis of cumulative impacts related to land use and planning is the city of Oceanside. As shown in Table 4-2, 44 projects are proposed for development in the vicinity of the project area. These projects primarily include residential and mixed-use projects

with a few commercial projects and a bridge replacement project. Similar to the development enabled by the Incentive District, these projects would be developed within areas of the city for meant for residential, mixed-use, and commercial uses as designated in the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance. The city is primarily urban and developed, and cumulative projects would be built on already developed parcels or as infill developments, where the underlying land uses are already connected with surrounding land uses. The Coast Highway Bridge Replacement project would replace the existing bridge structure over the San Luis Rey River and would not result in the physical division of the surrounding communities. For these reasons, development of the cumulative projects, in conjunction with the proposed project, would not physically divide an established community.

Development and redevelopment projects within the city of Oceanside would be required to be consistent with the existing General Plan and Local Coastal Plan land use designations and applicable Zoning Ordinance designations. The City of Oceanside would review each cumulative project as part of the development review process to ensure consistency with the policies of the General Plan and Zoning Ordinances unless there is a proposed land use policy amendment to the General Plan and/or Zoning Ordinance with the project application. At the time that an amendment to a land use policy to the General Plan and/or Zoning Ordinance is submitted, the City would need to evaluate if the proposed change to the land use policy would result in environmental impacts. With the safeguards of the development review process in place, the cumulative projects, in conjunction with the proposed project, would not result in foreseeable environmental impacts associated with conflicting with applicable land use plans, policies, or regulations.

Significance Determination: Less than significant

Noise and Vibration

Construction

The construction of the project includes the near-term construction of the project-level Complete Streets improvements, and the construction of potential redevelopment under the Incentive District. As previously discussed, the improvements are slated to occur in specific locations with a scheduled near-term start date and expected end date. The potential development and redevelopment under the Incentive District could occur at any qualifying parcel in the commercial area of the Incentive District at any time. Since the timing or sequencing of individual projects cannot be ascertained with any certainty any quantitative analysis to ascertain the daily construction noise levels of multiple, concurrent construction would be speculative. However, the construction of the potential development under the Incentive District could start in the near-term. Therefore, it is possible that the Complete Streets project component and individual development projects implemented under the Incentive District could occur simultaneously, as well as in proximity to each other.

The geographic scope for the consideration of cumulative project construction noise impacts are primarily the areas immediately surrounding the project site (as specified for the improvements

and potentially occurring within the Incentive District boundary) and to a lesser degree, along designated haul routes where heavy construction truck traffic would travel during the project construction period. Generally, noise impacts are limited to the area directly surrounding the noise source, as noise attenuates with distance from the source, and only has the potential to combine with other noise sources occurring simultaneously in the immediate vicinity.

The proposed project's impacts, when viewed together with the environmental impacts from past, present, and probable future projects, could be cumulatively considerable if ambient noise increases above the threshold. The project construction noise (for the Complete Streets improvements and the Incentive District) was determined to not expose persons to, or generate, noise levels in excess of standards established in the local General Plan or Noise Ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies. Therefore, noise impacts would be less than significant. However, due primarily to the dense development of the project area, project construction noise would be near sensitive receptors, likely resulting in a substantial temporary increase in ambient noise. Therefore, these impacts would be considered significant.

Implementation of mitigation measures would reduce construction noise impacts. However, mitigation measures 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. Therefore, impacts would be potentially significant and unavoidable with regard to a temporary substantial increase in ambient noise levels. Therefore, project construction noise would be of the magnitude to potentially combine with other cumulative projects potentially located in immediate proximity to the project site to cumulatively substantially temporarily increase the ambient noise environment in the project area. Therefore, project construction could be a cumulatively considerable noise impact.

The Complete Streets improvements would occur within existing roadway intersections and street segments, which are more than 25 feet from structures and inhabited buildings. Therefore, construction vibration levels would be less than the threshold (strongly perceptible to human), and the impact would be less than significant. However, construction activities associated with the Incentive District could result in temporary significant ground-borne vibration impacts that exceed the threshold of human perception to sensitive receptors located within 25 feet. Implementation of MM Incentive District NOI-1 would avoid construction ground-borne vibration impacts associated with implementation of the Incentive District. Due to the rapid attenuation characteristics of ground-borne vibration, and distance separating construction associated with the project and any other cumulative projects, there is not a likely potential for cumulative vibration impacts. Implementation of MM Incentive District NOI-1 would avoid construction ground-borne vibration impacts associated with implementation of the Incentive District. Therefore, cumulative vibration impacts would be less than significant.

Operation

The operation of the project includes the operation of the project-level Complete Streets improvements and the operation of the potential redevelopment under the Incentive District.

Typically, operational noise sources include stationary sources (e.g., HVAC systems of buildings) and/or mobile sources (e.g. vehicle trips).

The Complete Streets improvements would not construct any facilities with stationary noise sources (e.g., buildings) nor generate new vehicle trips; and therefore, would not introduce a new stationary or mobile operational noise sources. Therefore, there would be no operational noise impacts associated with the Complete Streets improvements. Implementation of the Incentive District would include the construction of new land uses which would include operational stationary noise sources and operational mobile sources from new vehicle trips.

Stationary noise sources associated with the Incentive District would generate operational noise from stationary equipment on each potential development site. Because noise attenuates with distance from its source, noise impacts from stationary sources would be limited to each of their respective sites and their vicinities. For this reason, the noise associated with stationary noise sources resulting from development under the Incentive District would not contribute to a cumulative stationary noise impact.

Vehicular traffic associated with the Incentive District would generate mobile operational noise. This analysis first considers whether noise associated with future traffic is an overall cumulative impact. It also considers to what degree the project would contribute to that cumulative noise impact and if that contribution is cumulatively considerable. Cumulative impacts from long-term mobile operational noise pertains to changes in roadway noise levels that could result from future traffic volumes associated with anticipated regional growth, including that under the Incentive District, along with traffic redistribution from the Complete Streets component of the project (**Table 4-3**). The incremental change for each street segment is compared to the significance threshold of 5 dBA CNEL. As shown in Table 4-3, the threshold would be exceeded for two street segments: along Wisconsin Avenue, between Freeman Street and Ditmar Street (5.1 dBA, CNEL) and along Washington Avenue, west of Coast Highway (5.7 dBA, CNEL). Therefore, future noise levels in these specific locations would be cumulatively significant.

**TABLE 4-3
TRAFFIC NOISE IMPACTS – FUTURE (2035) CUMULATIVE INCREMENT**

Roadway Segment	Calculated Traffic Noise Levels at 25 Feet from Roadway CNEL (dBA)			
	Existing (A)	Future with Project (B)	Cumulative Increment (B-A)	Exceed Threshold?
Coast Highway				
Between SR-76 Ramps and Surfrider Way	68.2	70.2	2.0	No
Between Surfrider Way and Civic Center Drive	66.3	68.3	2.0	No
Between Civic Center Drive and Pier View Way	66.3	68.4	2.1	No
Between Pier View Way and Mission Way	66.0	68.2	2.2	No
Between Mission Way and Seagaze Street	66.4	68.2	1.8	No
Between Seagaze Street and Missouri Avenue	66.7	67.0	0.3	No
Between Missouri Avenue and Washington Avenue	66.5	66.8	0.3	No
Between Washington Avenue and Wisconsin Avenue	66.5	67.1	0.6	No

**TABLE 4-3
TRAFFIC NOISE IMPACTS – FUTURE (2035) CUMULATIVE INCREMENT**

Roadway Segment	Calculated Traffic Noise Levels at 25 Feet from Roadway CNEL (dBA)			
	Existing (A)	Future with Project (B)	Cumulative Increment (B-A)	Exceed Threshold?
Between Wisconsin Avenue and Oceanside Boulevard	67.3	68.3	1.0	No
Between Oceanside Boulevard and Morse Street	67.4	69.0	1.6	No
Between Morse Street and Cassidy Street	66.9	68.6	1.7	No
Between Cassidy Street and Vista Way	67.5	69.1	1.6	No
Between Vista Way and Eaton Street	67.0	69.0	2.0	No
Vista Way				
Between Broadway Street and Coast Highway	60.5	62.3	1.8	No
Between Coast Highway and Ditmar Street	67.3	68.7	1.4	No
Cassidy Street				
Between Broadway Street and Tremont Street	61.9	62.8	0.9	No
Between Tremont Street and Coast Highway	63.0	64.4	1.4	No
Between Coast Highway and Freeman Street	62.2	63.8	1.6	No
Between Freeman Street and Ditmar Street	62.0	60.2	-1.8	No
Morse Street				
Between Coast Highway and Freeman Street	60.2	63.9	3.7	No
Between Freeman Street and Ditmar Street	57.3	61.4	4.1	No
Oceanside Boulevard				
Between Tremont Street and Coast Highway	62.9	64.4	1.5	No
Between Coast Highway and Ditmar Street	68.4	68.7	0.3	No
Wisconsin Avenue				
Between Tremont Street and Coast Highway	63.3	65.3	2.0	No
Between Coast Highway and Freeman Street	59.9	63.0	3.1	No
Between Freeman Street and Ditmar Street	59.9	65.0	5.1	Yes
Washington Avenue				
West of Coast Highway	53.3	59.0	5.7	Yes
East of Coast Highway	53.0	56.5	3.5	No
Missouri Avenue				
West of Coast Highway	55.4	54.6	-0.8	No
East of Coast Highway	53.2	55.8	2.6	No
Michigan Avenue				
West of Coast Highway	60.2	61.2	1.0	No
East of Coast Highway	57.6	59.6	2.0	No
Seagaze Street				
Between Tremont Street and Coast Highway	63.9	66.1	2.2	No
Between Coast Highway and Freeman Street	64.5	63.0	-1.5	No
Between Freeman Street and Ditmar Street	64.5	66.8	2.3	No
Mission Avenue				
Between Cleveland Street and Coast Highway	63.1	64.9	1.8	No
Between Coast Highway and Horne Street	64.0	64.5	0.5	No

**TABLE 4-3
TRAFFIC NOISE IMPACTS – FUTURE (2035) CUMULATIVE INCREMENT**

Roadway Segment	Calculated Traffic Noise Levels at 25 Feet from Roadway CNEL (dBA)			
	Existing (A)	Future with Project (B)	Cumulative Increment (B-A)	Exceed Threshold?
Pier View Way				
West of Coast Highway	59.8	62.0	2.2	No
Between Coast Highway and Horne Street	58.8	55.1	-3.7	No
Civic Center Drive				
West of Coast Highway	57.8	60.9	3.1	No
East of Coast Highway	59.8	60.7	0.9	No
Surfrider Way				
West of Coast Highway	62.8	64.7	1.9	No
East of Coast Highway	58.8	61.5	2.7	No
Vandergrift Boulevard				
North of San Rafael Drive	71.7	72.4	0.7	No
South of San Rafael Drive	71.6	72.3	0.7	No
State Route 76				
West of I-5 SB On-Ramp	71.1	72.7	1.6	No
East of I-5 SB On-Ramp	72.1	73.5	1.4	No
Mission Avenue				
West of I-5 SB Off-Ramp	72.0	68.9	-3.1	No
East of I-5 SB Off-Ramp	70.6	68.1	-2.5	No
Oceanside Boulevard				
West of I-5 SB On/Off-Ramp	70.6	70.3	-0.3	No
East of I-5 NB On/Off-Ramp	70.6	71.1	0.5	No
California Street				
West of Soto Street/I-5 NB On-Ramp	62.1	59.2	-2.9	No
Cassidy Street				
East of I-5 SB On-Ramp/I-5 SB Off-Ramp	64.3	61.1	-3.2	No
Vista Way				
West of I-5 SB On/Off-Ramp	73.0	72.5	-0.5	No

^a Based on noise levels at 25 feet distance from the roadway and residential uses if residential uses are shown along roadways.

SOURCE: ESA 2018

The project's contribution to the cumulative noise impacts along these 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 (see Table 4-3). The project's contribution to increases in future noise levels along Wisconsin Avenue between Freeman Street and Ditmar Street is predicted to be 5.1_dBA CNEL and the project's contribution to increases in future noise levels along Washington Avenue west of Coast Highway is predicted to be 5.7 dBA CNEL. In both locations, the project's contribution would be perceptible (greater than 3 dBA) and would

exceed the 5 dBA noise significance threshold. 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.

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.

As previously discussed for project operation vibration, operational vibration impacts of the Complete Streets improvements at the off-site receptors would be consistent with the existing ambient vibration velocity levels. Operational vibration impacts of the Complete Streets improvements would be less than significant. Ground-borne vibration generated by the Incentive District development would be similar to the existing vibration generated by existing operational sources (i.e., similar to traffic vibration on adjacent roadways) in the vicinity. The potential vibration impacts from all operation activities at the closest structure locations would be less than the significance threshold of human perception. Therefore, vibration impacts associated with operation of the projects developed under the Incentive District provisions would be below the significance threshold, and operational impacts would be less than significant. Due to the rapid attenuation of ground-borne vibration, vibration levels similar to ambient levels, and distance separating development associated with the project and any other cumulative projects, there is no potential for cumulative vibration impacts. Therefore, cumulative vibration impacts would be less than significant.

Significance Determination: Significant and unavoidable

Population and Housing

The geographic context for the analysis of cumulative impacts associated with population and housing is the city of Oceanside. As the Complete Streets component of the project would not result in any effects on population growth or housing stock, either indirectly or directly, it would not result in any contribution to cumulative environmental impacts related to population or housing. Regarding the proposed Incentive District, this project component could result in an increase in the city's population since the intent of the Incentive District is to provide a stimulus in the project area to encourage the City's preferred development type and pattern. However, the relative growth that could occur under the Incentive District could also occur under current land use regulations, although there might be slight shifts of intensity from site to site.

The potential environmental impacts that could result from future growth, both within the Incentive District boundaries and in the surrounding areas of the city, have been considered in the environmental topical analyses in this EIR (e.g., traffic, air quality, biological resources, etc.). Additional sources of growth or development that could increase or exacerbate these considered effects are not known and/or have not been identified. For these reasons, the proposed project would not result in any additional cumulatively considerable environmental impact associated with population and housing that have not been identified elsewhere in this environmental document.

Significance Determination: Less than significant

Public Services

The geographic context for the analysis of cumulative impacts related to public services is the city of Oceanside. Implementation of the proposed project in combination with cumulative development in the city could result in an increased demand for public services. However, the City has established a fee structure for all future and cumulative projects to ensure that the City can continue to provide public services and can strive to maintain established service ratios, response times, and other performance objectives for fire and police protection, schools, and other public facilities with future population growth envisioned under the General Plan.

If cumulative projects accelerate development as compared to conditions without the Incentive District, additional fees would be collected. These fees would then provide for the development of additional facilities to service the new development and population. However, the specific location, timing, and nature of these additional facilities are not known at this time. While consideration of the environmental effects of these future facilities within the city would be speculative and is not within the scope of this CEQA document, the environmental effects of the future development of those facilities would be required to adhere to the requirements of CEQA when they are proposed by the City of Oceanside in the future. Because all future project applicants proposing residential and non-residential projects in the city would be required to pay fees that would fund additional facilities to serve the new population, it can be reasonably assumed that the City of Oceanside would continue to keep pace with the population growth within the city such that demand and performance objectives of these facilities would be met. As each individual development is proposed, the City would have the opportunity to review and consider their effect to public services. Therefore, with these parameters and safeguards, cumulative impacts related to new or altered public facilities would be less than significant.

Significance Determination: Less than significant

Recreation and Parks

The geographic context for the analysis of cumulative impacts related to recreational facilities is the city of Oceanside. While the city currently has a small deficit in the amount of parkland required to maintain the parkland standard, the City has established a fee structure to ensure that the City can generally maintain the established parkland standard of 5 acres per 1,000 residents

with future population growth. Future residential development would be required to pay the City's park fees in order to provide funding for new park and recreational facilities.

Adoption of the Incentive District would provide optional regulations and standards which a developer or property owner may choose in lieu of the existing underlying zoning. The Incentive District would allow for different types of residential, commercial, and mixed-use developments throughout the corridor, which could result in an increase in the city's population. The intent of the Incentive District is to provide a stimulus in the project area to encourage the City's preferred development type and pattern in the project area. However, the growth that could occur under the Incentive District would be required to be consistent with the City's General Plan and thus, would not exceed the population growth anticipated by the General Plan.

If growth is accelerated within the city as a result of adoption of the Incentive District, the parks fee would allow for the additional development of parks and recreation facilities. However, the specific location, timing, and nature of these additional park facilities are not known at this time. The consideration of the environmental effects of future parks and recreation facilities that may be proposed by the City (but which are currently unplanned) would be speculative and, for this reason, are not within the scope of this EIR. However, the environmental effects of the future development of those facilities would be required to adhere to the requirements of CEQA at the time of development.

With the payment of the parks fee, future development and redevelopment within the city as a whole would provide for adequate parks and recreation facilities and ensure that the substantial physical deterioration of parks and recreation facilities would not be accelerated. The proposed project would not significantly contribute to cumulative environmental effects resulting from the development of other park and recreation facilities since there are not any known park and recreation projects currently proposed within the city that could result in these types of impacts. For these reasons, the proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable environmental impact to parks and/or recreational facilities.

Significance Determination: Less than significant

Transportation and Traffic

The geographic context for the analysis of cumulative impacts related to transportation is the study area defined in the TIA. As shown in Table 4-2, development within the city consists primarily of residential projects with a few commercial projects and a bridge replacement project. The analyses provided in Issue 1 (conflicts with applicable circulations plans) and Issue 2 (conflicts with an applicable congestion management plan) in Section 3.14 of this EIR include the analysis of cumulative impacts associated with other projects within the TIA study area both in the near and long term. Refer to those discussions for the proposed project's potential cumulative impacts and mitigation measures. As stated in Section 3.14, implementation of the proposed project would result in significant and unavoidable impacts to two intersections in the Future Conditions with Project scenario. Therefore, the project's contribution to cumulative traffic impacts at the intersections at Coast Highway and Wisconsin Avenue and Vista Way and Stewart Street are considered cumulatively considerable and would be significant and unavoidable.

Similar to the project, cumulative development would be required to provide proper notification in compliance with Oceanside Municipal Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan when applicable. Therefore, cumulative impacts to air traffic patterns would not occur.

While there would be a general increase in vehicle traffic under cumulative conditions, the proposed project would not create potentially hazardous traffic safety conditions (including for emergency vehicles), or otherwise interfere with emergency vehicle accessibility to the site and adjoining areas. Thus, the project would not contribute a significant cumulatively considerable contribution to impacts to traffic safety hazards or emergency access.

A cumulative impact to alternative transportation facilities could occur if future development projects removed alternative transportation facilities, such as bus stops or bike racks, or did not provide additional alternative transportation facilities to accommodate the residents of the city. However, the proposed project would provide continuous bicycle lanes throughout the Coast Highway corridor, improve pedestrian safety with mid-block crosswalks throughout the corridor to provide multiple crossing points, and enhance pedestrian travel with streetscaping. Further, the proposed project could allow for a higher density of residential uses near existing transit centers within the city, which would provide regional access to alternative transportation to residents. Thus, the project would not contribute a significant cumulatively considerable contribution to alternative transportation impacts.

Significance Determination: Significant and unavoidable

Utilities and Service Systems

The geographic context for the analysis of water and wastewater capacities and facilities as well as storm water drainage facilities is the city of Oceanside. The proposed project, in combination with cumulative projects, would lead to an increase in water demand and wastewater generation. The City, as the provider of water and wastewater facilities, would confirm availability of adequate water supply, water treatment capacity, and wastewater treatment capacity prior to future project approval. In addition, the City has established a fee structure for all projects to ensure that the City can continue to maintain water and wastewater connections and drainage facilities. The fees would apply to all projects developed under the Incentive District as well as the projects listed in the cumulative projects list. These fees would then provide for the development of additional facilities to service the new development and population. In addition, the City anticipates growth within its boundaries, including the projects listed in the cumulative projects list and projects that could be developed within the boundaries of the Incentive District. This anticipated growth is generally in line with the pace of growth that is already anticipated by the City. The City would also continue to monitor population growth and update its 5-year master plans and capital improvement plans to adjust to changes in growth and development trends and economic conditions. With these factors, it can be reasonably assumed that the City of Oceanside would continue to keep pace with the population growth within the city such that demand and performance objectives of water, wastewater, and storm drainage systems are met. Therefore, with these parameters and safeguards, cumulative impacts related to new or altered water, wastewater, or drainage facilities would be less than significant.

The geographic context for the analysis of cumulative impacts in regard to landfill capacity is the El Sobrante Landfill. The El Sobrante Landfill is permitted to accept 16,054 tons per day, or 112,378 tons per week. Based on waste generation projections from the areas the landfill serves calculated against the landfill's footprint and unused waste capacity, the landfill has an anticipated closure date of 2045 (Riverside County 2017). The cumulative projects listed in Table 4-2 and the proposed project, as well as all future projects within the city of Oceanside, would be subject to the City's Zero Waste Plan, which has a goal to divert 75 percent of waste to landfills by 2020. The implementation of the Zero Waste Plan would extend the expected lifetime of the El Sobrante Landfill. Because the El Sobrante Landfill has a significant excess capacity, which is provided till a closure date that is more than 25 years into the future, the effect of the proposed project and the cumulative projects is nominal. Potential growth in the city of Oceanside, including development under the Incentive District and the cumulative projects list, is well within the capacity and projected waste acceptance parameters of the El Sobrante Landfill and the waste diverted to the landfill, on a per capita basis, is expected to continue to decline. Therefore, the proposed project, in combination with cumulative projects, would not have a cumulative impact on landfill capacity.

Significance Determination: Less than significant