

Chapter 1 Executive Summary

This chapter is a summary of the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Oak Creek project (hereafter referred to as “Project”). This chapter highlights the impacts that have the potential to occur as a result of implementation of the Project, as determined by the environmental analysis provided in this EIR, in compliance with California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines §15123. The chapter also provides a brief description of the Project, project objectives, alternatives to the Project, areas of controversy, and issues to be resolved. Table 1.1-1, Summary of Project Impacts, at the end of this chapter provides the following information: 1) the direct and cumulative impacts that would occur from implementation of the Project; 2) the significance of impact before mitigation; 3) the recommended mitigation measures that would avoid or reduce significant environmental impacts; and 4) the significance of impact after mitigation measures are implemented. Table 1.1-2, Comparison of Alternatives – Environmental Impacts, compares the anticipated impacts of the Project with those of each project alternative.

1.1 Project Location and Description

The approximately 41.4-acre project site is located within the unincorporated area of northern San Diego County, California, within the City of Escondido’s (City’s) adopted Sphere of Influence (SOI), and is contiguous to the City’s boundary at the intersection of Felicita Road and Hamilton Lane. The main portion of the project site consists of an irregularly shaped property generally bounded on the north by Hamilton Lane, the west and south by Felicita Road, and the east by Miller Avenue. A small “panhandle” to the property is located adjacent to the northeast corner of the main project site. The panhandle area includes land along either side of Hamilton Lane east of Miller Avenue and west of Interstate 15 (I-15).

The Project proposes a reorganization including annexing the project site to the City and detachment from County Service Area No. 135 (Regional Communications). Annexation would implement the City’s General Plan, which designates the subject properties Estate II. Annexation would require approval from the San Diego Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) and would include the project site, the approximately 2.34-acre Chalice Unitarian Universalist Congregation property located at 2324 Miller Avenue, and portions of adjacent roadways. The Congregation was included in the annexation action as a result of a LAFCO-requested survey, which indicated the owners of the Congregation desired to be annexed to the City. Both properties also would be detached from Rincon Del Diablo Municipal Water District (Rincon Water) Improvement District “E”, which contracts with the City for fire protection and emergency services. Six proposed lots in the panhandle along Hamilton Lane would be annexed to Rincon Water Improvement District “I” for water service. Annexation or

detachments from Improvement Districts are typically conditions of LAFCO approval and subject to the parent district's approval.

The Project would construct 65 single-family detached residences. The residential lots would encompass approximately 22.44 acres of the site and would have an average gross lot size of approximately 14,619 square feet. The site is designated Estate II by the Escondido General Plan Update (2012), which allows for 1 dwelling unit per 0.5, 1, 20 acre (du/ac). Homes built on the site would be either one or two stories with attached garages. Internal to the development on private streets, sidewalks would be constructed along one side of the development with decorative street lighting that would be minimally located at intersections and cul-de-sacs. The decorative light fixture, instead of the standard City light fixture, was selected to blend more closely with the existing community character.

The project would include the conservation of approximately 9.8 acres of biological open space provided within two dedicated open space lots. The open space areas would be primarily along existing drainages along the western site boundary and north-central portion of the site that drain to a seasonal pond in the southwest corner of the property. The biological open space areas would be preserved in their natural state with a permanent conservation easement and mechanism for privately funded on-going maintenance. Enhancement and restoration of the open space areas would include removal of non-native species and seeding/planting with a mix of native shrubs and trees. Public pedestrian access to the pond would be provided. At present, the pond is on private property.

The project site would have one vehicular entrance/exit (exclusive of emergency access), located off of Felicita Road approximately 800 feet north of the Felicita Road/Miller Avenue intersection. Two emergency access gates would be located off of Hamilton Lane at the end of on-site cul-de-sacs. In addition, the project would include half-street roadway improvements along Felicita Road, Miller Avenue, and Hamilton Lane frontage. As part of widening the east side of Felicita Road, a retaining wall would be built varying in height from one to six feet to minimize grading impacts to Felicita Creek riparian habitat.

The Project would involve grading resulting in cut and fill slopes within the project site to accommodate several building pads. All modified slopes would have a 2:1 inclination ratio. The Project would be landscaped with native and drought-tolerant, low water use vegetation meeting low or medium water use classification of landscape species rating to minimize water consumption.

Project utilities construction would include the extension of gas and electric transmission facilities, sewer and water pipelines, and communications facilities. The site would be designed so that runoff from the residential lots would drain to the private streets within the subdivision. On-site drainage improvements would include a storm drain system and flood attenuation/bio-retention basins to safely convey, clean urban runoff, provide hydromodification management,

and mitigate increases in peak storm water flow rates discharging from the Project during a 50-year storm. The project also includes a Specific Alignment Plan (Appendix A) that provides proposed modifications to local collector standards for Felicita Road and Hamilton Lane, using the Specific Alignment Plan. Further, the Project proposes traffic calming features along Felicita Road. These improvements are described in detail in Chapter 4, Project Description, and Section 5.14, Transportation and Traffic.

Project construction is estimated to occur over an approximately 39-month period, beginning in the 3rd quarter of 2015 and ending in the 4th quarter of 2017. Construction would be separated into two phases: site and infrastructure improvements (lasting approximately 13 months) and residential construction (lasting approximately 30 months). There would be an estimated five to six months of overlap between the two phases, though timing could change.

1.2 Project Objectives

The Project intends to fulfill the following key objectives:

1. Annex the property consistent with the San Diego Local Agency Formation Commission's adopted SOI for the City of Escondido and the long-range planning policies of the County of San Diego and City of Escondido.
2. Propose an overall residential density that is ***less*** than the applicable General Plan land use designations of the City of Escondido (Estate II, 2.0 du/ac, maximum yield of 80 units based on site-specific slope conditions) and County of San Diego (Village Residential, VR-2.9 du/ac, maximum yield of 122 dwelling units).
3. Permanently preserve approximately one-third of the site as open space.
4. Cluster housing to protect environmental resources identified in technical constraints studies.
5. Restore, enhance, and maintain the existing seasonal pond as an amenity which is accessible to the public.
6. Minimize impacts to jurisdictional wetland areas to less than one acre.
7. Ensure that Project traffic from the Oak Creek Project does not create significant impacts as defined by the City of Escondido's CEQA significance criteria.
8. Fund and construct off-site traffic calming features on Felicita Road in response to the community's desire to reduce speed, enhance pedestrian safety, and provide for pedestrian connectivity to Miller Ave, Hamilton Lane and Felicita Road.
9. Provide Felicita Road as a modified Local Collector that minimizes conflicts with adjacent properties' existing off-site improvements.
10. Limit non-emergency vehicular access to the project to reduce potential conflicts with traffic traveling on surrounding streets.
11. Balance transportation needs with the preference of the immediately adjacent neighbors to have more rural-appearing public improvements.

12. Comply with the City of Escondido's goal of developing their portion of the San Diego Association of Governments' fair share Regional Housing Needs Allocation by providing new in-fill housing.
13. Design the project in a manner that appeals to the area's growing demand for high quality homes.
14. Coordinate all design components of the Project such as landscaping, signage, lighting, internal street design, and building materials/elevations.
15. Annex the property to the City of Escondido to provide a connection to a public sewer system rather than relying on private septic tanks.

1.3 Impact Summary

This EIR examines the potential environmental effects from implementation of the Project, including information related to existing site conditions, analyses of the types and magnitude of individual and cumulative environmental impacts, and feasible mitigation measures that could reduce or avoid environmental impacts. In accordance with Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, the potentially significant environmental effects of the Project are analyzed for the following issue areas:

- | | |
|--|---------------------------------|
| ■ Aesthetics | ■ Hydrology and Water Quality |
| ■ Agricultural Resources | ■ Land Use |
| ■ Air Quality | ■ Noise |
| ■ Biological Resources | ■ Public Services |
| ■ Cultural and Paleontological Resources | ■ Recreation |
| ■ Geology and Soils | ■ Transportation and Traffic |
| ■ Greenhouse Gas Emissions | ■ Utilities and Service Systems |
| ■ Hazards and Hazardous Materials | |

The 15 environmental aspects listed above that have potentially significant impacts are addressed in detail in this EIR. The Project is not anticipated to result in impacts to population and housing, recreation, forestry resources, and mineral resources; therefore, these issues are not addressed in detail in this EIR.

This EIR also contains other mandatory discussions required by CEQA including the analysis of cumulative impacts provided in the various subsections of Chapter 5, Environmental Analysis; effects found not to be significant, growth inducement, significant and unavoidable environmental effects, and significant irreversible environmental effects provide in the various subsections of Chapter 6, Other CEQA Considerations; and alternatives to the Project provided in Chapter 7, Project Alternatives.

1.4 Alternatives to the Project

Four alternatives to the Project were assessed: 1) No Project Alternative; 2) Less Dense Alternative (Without Annexation/Public Sewers [20 Units]); 3) Reduced Jurisdictional Habitat Impact Alternative (62 Units); and 4) Reduced Residential Footprint Alternative (65 Units). Under the No Project Alternative, no development would occur on the project site, and the project site and the Chalice Unitarian Universalist Congregation property would not be annexed to the City or detached from County Service Area No. 135. The Less Dense Alternative (Without Annexation/Public Sewers) also would not involve annexation to the City, and 20 lots could be developed, subject to septic sewer requirements. Development for the Reduced Jurisdictional Habitat Impact Alternative avoids on-site jurisdictional areas (excluding Felicita Road) and constructs 62 units. Under the Reduced Residential Footprint Alternative, 65 residential lots would be developed, with no homes developed east of Miller Avenue.

1.5 Areas of Controversy

The City has received correspondence from the public requesting the preparation of an EIR and voicing concerns about potential effects the Project might have on the environment. Those concerns are summarized below.

- Aesthetics
 - New development, with higher density, gates, walls, and streets, would affect the rural character of the area.
- Agricultural Resources
 - Thresholds for cumulative loss through conversion of agricultural land and open space should be addressed in the EIR.
- Air Quality
 - Persons residing within 500 feet of I-15 would have increased cancer and non-cancer health risks. Children and the elderly residing within 1,000 feet would have additional non-cancer health risks.
 - The new development would contribute to pollution.
- Biological Resources
 - New development would introduce invasive species to the site.
- Greenhouse Gas
 - The EIR should analyze greenhouse gas (GHG) and energy demand and the resulting requirements for energy efficiency and renewable energy.
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials

- Pesticides/toxins soil studies should be conducted on land that has been in agricultural use.
- Hydrology and Water Quality
 - Discharges of reclaimed water into the Felicita Creek and Lake Hodges may affect water quality.
 - New development would exacerbate stream flooding. Impacts would extend far beyond 500 feet.
 - New detention basins would require long-term management and maintenance.
- Noise
 - The additional traffic on Felicita Road would increase traffic noise.
- Public Services - Sewer Capacity
 - The development of homes, in addition to other proposed projects with sewer hook ups, may exceed its ability to operate, and may result in water contamination.
- Recreation
 - The new development would negatively impact Felicita County Park.
- Transportation and Traffic
 - Increased traffic on Felicita Road would result in the potential for future accidents and congestion.
 - Roadway improvements would promote higher speeds.

1.6 Issues to be Resolved by the Decision-making Body

The issues to be resolved by the decision-making body include whether and how to mitigate the significant effects of the Project; consideration of the various mitigation measures and alternatives recommended in the EIR by City staff and interested persons and organizations; and whether the discretionary approvals required to implement the Project and its development components should be granted.

Table 1.1-1 Summary of Project Impacts

Issue Topic	Potential Direct Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	Mitigation Measures	Impact After Mitigation
5.1 Aesthetics				
Scenic Vistas	Less than significant	Less than significant	No mitigation required	No mitigation required
Scenic Resources	No impact	No impact	No mitigation required	No mitigation required
Visual Character or Quality	Less than significant	Less than significant	No mitigation required	No mitigation required
Light and Glare	Less than significant	Less than significant	No mitigation required	No mitigation required
5.2 Agricultural Resources				
Direct Conversion of Agricultural Resources	Less than significant	Less than significant	No mitigation required	No mitigation required
Land Use Conflicts	Less than significant	Less than significant	No mitigation required	No mitigation required
Indirect Conversion of Agricultural Resources	Less than significant	Less than significant	No mitigation required	No mitigation required
5.3 Air Quality				
Air Quality Plans	Less than significant	Less than significant	No mitigation required	No mitigation required

Table 1.1-1 Summary of Project Impacts

Issue Topic	Potential Direct Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	Mitigation Measures	Impact After Mitigation
Air Quality Violations	Potentially significant	Potentially significant	<p>Air-1 Construction Dust Control Measures. The on-site construction superintendent shall ensure implementation of standard best management practices to reduce the emissions of fugitive dust during all grading and site preparation activities including, but not limited to, the following actions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Water any exposed soil areas a minimum of twice per day, or as allowed under any imposed drought restrictions. On windy days or when fugitive dust can be observed leaving the construction site, additional water shall be applied at a frequency to be determined by the on-site construction superintendent. 2. Temporary hydroseeding with irrigation shall be implemented on all graded areas on slopes, and areas of cleared vegetation shall be revegetated as soon as possible following grading activities in areas that will remain in a disturbed condition (but will not be subject to further construction activities) for a period greater than three months during the construction phase. 3. Operate all vehicles on the construction site at speeds less than 15 miles per hour. 4. Cover all stockpiles that will not be utilized within three days with plastic or equivalent material, to be determined by the on-site construction superintendent, or spray them with a non-toxic chemical stabilizer. 5. If a street sweeper is used to remove any track-out/carry-out, only PM₁₀-efficient street sweepers certified to meet the most current South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 1186 requirements shall be used. The use of blowers for removal of track-out/carry-out is prohibited under any circumstances. 	Less than significant
Criteria Pollutant Increase	Less than significant	Less than significant	No mitigation required	No mitigation required

Table 1.1-1 Summary of Project Impacts

Issue Topic	Potential Direct Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	Mitigation Measures	Impact After Mitigation
Sensitive Receptors	Less than significant	Less than significant	No mitigation required	No mitigation required
Objectionable Odors	Less than significant	Less than significant	No mitigation required	No mitigation required
4 Biological Resources				
Special Status Plant and Wildlife Species	Potentially significant	Less than significant	Bio-1 Potential direct impacts to migratory bird species covered under the MBTA shall be mitigated by restricting brush removal and site grading to outside of the breeding season of most bird species (February 15 to September 15). Grubbing, grading, or clearing during the breeding season of MBTA covered species could occur if it is determined through a pre-construction survey by a qualified biologist that no nesting birds are present immediately prior to grubbing, grading, or clearing activities. A nesting survey report shall be submitted to the City for review and approval confirming that no breeding or nesting avian species are present in areas proposed for grubbing, grading, or clearing no longer than seven days prior to grading.	Less than significant

Table 1.1-1 Summary of Project Impacts

Issue Topic	Potential Direct Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	Mitigation Measures	Impact After Mitigation
Special Status Plant and Wildlife Species (continued)			<p>Bio-2 The following measures shall be implemented to reduce indirect impacts to sensitive species to below a level of significance.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Active construction areas and unpaved surfaces shall be watered pursuant to City grading permit requirements to ensure that generation of fugitive dust is minimized. 2. Orange construction fencing shall be installed prior to the start of construction to define the proposed limits of construction impacts and clearly define the grading boundaries, and biological monitoring of on-site open space shall be conducted during grading and construction activities prevent unintended impacts. 3. The Project shall address potential water quality impacts through compliance with the City's Grading Ordinance (See Section 33-1062, 33-1063, 33-1068, 33-1069) and implementation of the proposed best temporary construction management practices outlined in the Stormwater Management Plan (silt fence, fiber rolls, street sweeping and vacuuming, storm drain inlet protection, solid waste management, stabilized construction entrance/exit, desilting basin, gravel bag berm, sandbag barrier, material delivery and storage, and any minor slopes will be covered with a plastic or tarp prior to a rain event). 4. All construction and security lighting associated with the Project shall be shielded or directed away from the open space. 5. After construction is complete, Project landscaping shall not include any California Invasive Plant Council (Cal-IPC) List A species. 6. A homeowner education program shall be implemented to alert homeowners of the need to keep pets outside of the on-site open space areas. 	

Table 1.1-1 Summary of Project Impacts

Issue Topic	Potential Direct Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	Mitigation Measures	Impact After Mitigation
Special Status Plant and Wildlife Species (continued)			<p>Bio-3 All brush removal, grading, and clearing of vegetation on the project site shall take place outside of the bird breeding season (February 15 [January 1 for tree dwelling raptors] through September 15). If construction activities are proposed to occur during the breeding season, a pre-construction survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist no longer than seven days prior to the start of construction to determine if nesting birds are present on site. No construction activities shall occur within 300 feet of burrowing owl burrows, tree dwelling raptor nests, or least Bell's vireo, or within 800 feet of ground dwelling raptor nests, until a qualified biologist has determined that they are no longer active or that noise levels will not exceed 60 dB(A) Equivalent Energy Level (L_{eq}) at the nest site. Alternatively, noise minimization measures such as noise barriers shall be constructed to bring noise levels to below 60 dB(A) L_{eq}, which will reduce the impact to below a level of significance.</p>	
Riparian Habitat and Other Sensitive Natural Communities	Potentially significant	Less than significant	<p>Bio-4 The Project would cause direct impacts to 1.1 acre of coast live oak woodland (0.9 acre of which is outside of CDFW jurisdiction), 0.1 acre of Diegan coastal sage scrub, and 3.1 acres of non-native grassland. Impacts to 0.9 acre of coast live oak woodland shall be mitigated at a 3:1 ratio through acquisition of 2.7 acres of credit from the Daley Ranch Mitigation Bank. The remaining 0.27 acre of coast live oak woodland within CDFW jurisdiction is addressed in mitigation measure Bio-5 below. Impacts to 0.1 acre of Diegan coastal sage scrub shall be mitigated at a 2:1 ratio through acquisition of 0.2 acre of credits from the Daley Ranch Mitigation Bank, while impacts to non-native grassland shall be mitigated at a 0.5:1 ratio through acquisition of 1.6 acres of credits from the Daley Ranch Mitigation Bank. See Table 5.4-8 for a summary of mitigation requirements.</p>	Less than significant

Table 1.1-1 Summary of Project Impacts

Issue Topic	Potential Direct Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	Mitigation Measures	Impact After Mitigation
Riparian Habitat and Other Sensitive Natural Communities (continued)			<p>Bio-5 The Project applicant shall obtain wetland permits and approvals for impacts to USACE and CDFW jurisdictional areas. See Table 5.4-9 for a summary of mitigation requirements for jurisdictional areas. Impacts to southern willow riparian forest, southern coast live oak riparian forest, and coast live oak woodland jurisdictional habitats are anticipated to require a 3:1 mitigation ratio through creation and/or restoration and/or enhancement of riparian or oak woodland habitat on site. Impacts to CDFW eucalyptus woodland and non-wetland waters of the U.S./CDFW streambeds shall be mitigated through creation/restoration at a 1:1 ratio. This will require creation/restoration of approximately 0.07 acre of drainages, of which a minimum of 0.07 acre must be USACE jurisdictional. Wetland mitigation is proposed to occur within the 9.8 acres of open space along existing on-site drainages, with final mitigation requirements to be determined by the resource agencies through the permitting process. On-site mitigation is proposed to consist of recontouring a portion of the stream channel, removal of non-native species, and seeding/ planting with a mix of native shrubs and trees. A detailed restoration, maintenance and monitoring plan shall be prepared by a qualified restoration ecologist/biologist and shall be approved by the City prior to issuance of a grading permit.</p>	
Federally Protected Wetlands	Potentially significant	Less than significant	Bio-5 Refer to text above.	Less than significant
Wildlife Movement Corridors and Nursery Sites	No impact	No impact	No mitigation required	No mitigation required

Table 1.1-1 Summary of Project Impacts

Issue Topic	Potential Direct Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	Mitigation Measures	Impact After Mitigation
Local Policies and Ordinances	Potentially significant	Less than significant	Bio-6 Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the Project applicant shall submit a Conceptual Habitat Restoration Plan (CHRP) to the City Community Development Department for review and approval. The CHRP shall be a cohesive restoration and monitoring plan that addresses site-wide restoration/mitigation efforts and includes a tree planting, canopy cover goal, and monitoring component. The CHRP shall specify native oak, willow, sycamore, and cottonwood tree planting details, locations, and long-term maintenance and monitoring for the mitigation of trees. The CHRP shall be used to prepare bidding construction documents for site preparation, tree installation, and maintenance. The CHRP shall require that a knowledgeable arborist or biologist be retained to monitor mitigation tree plantings for a period of five years. The CHRP also shall outline reporting protocols and standards for mitigation tree replacement, should it be necessary if canopy cover goals are not being achieved. Table 5.4-13 identifies the total number of plantings required to meet the intent of the City's tree protection and replacement requirements. Upon approval of the CHRP, the Project applicant shall implement the plan.	Less than significant
Habitat Conservation Plan and NCCP	No impact	No impact	No mitigation required	No mitigation required
5.5 Cultural Resources				
Historical Resources	Less than significant	Less than significant	No mitigation required	No mitigation required

Table 1.1-1 Summary of Project Impacts

Issue Topic	Potential Direct Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	Mitigation Measures	Impact After Mitigation
Archaeological Resources	Potentially significant	Less than significant	<p>Cul-1 The following mitigation monitoring program shall be implemented to address potential impacts to undiscovered buried archaeological resources within the project site. This program shall include, but not be limited to, the following actions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the applicant shall provide written verification to the City that a qualified archaeologist has been retained to implement the monitoring program. This verification shall be presented in a letter from the Project archaeologist to the lead agency. The City, prior to any pre-construction meeting, shall approve all persons involved in the monitoring program, including a qualified Native American monitor. 2. The qualified archaeologist shall attend the pre-grading meeting with the contractors to explain and coordinate the requirements of the monitoring program. 3. During the original cutting of previously undisturbed deposits, the archaeological monitor(s) shall be on-site full-time to perform periodic inspections of the excavations. The frequency of inspections shall depend on the rate of excavation, the materials excavated, and the presence and abundance of artifacts and features. 4. A Native American monitor will accompany the archaeologist monitor during the initial cutting of the first five feet in depth of soil in the area of CA-SDI-14,955. 5. Isolates and clearly non-significant deposits shall be minimally documented in the field so the monitored grading can proceed. 	Less than significant

Table 1.1-1 Summary of Project Impacts

Issue Topic	Potential Direct Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	Mitigation Measures	Impact After Mitigation
Archaeological Resources (continued)			<p>6. In the event that previously unidentified cultural resources are discovered, the archaeologist shall have the authority to divert or temporarily halt ground disturbance operation in the area of discovery to allow for the evaluation of potentially significant cultural resources. The archaeologist shall contact the City's Project manager at the time of discovery. The archaeologist, in consultation with the City's Project manager, shall determine the significance of the discovered resources. The City must concur with the evaluation before construction activities will be allowed to resume in the affected area. For significant cultural resources, a Research Design and Data Recovery Program to mitigate impacts shall be prepared by the consulting archaeologist and approved by the lead agency, then carried out using professional archaeological methods. If any human bones are discovered, the County Coroner and City shall be contacted. In the event that the remains are determined to be of Native American origin, the Most Likely Descendant, as identified by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), shall be contacted in order to determine proper treatment and disposition of the remains.</p> <p>7. Before construction activities are allowed to resume in the affected area, the artifacts shall be recovered and features recorded using professional archaeological methods. The archaeological monitor(s) shall determine the amount of material to be recovered for an adequate artifact sample for analysis.</p>	

Table 1.1-1 Summary of Project Impacts

Issue Topic	Potential Direct Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	Mitigation Measures	Impact After Mitigation
Archaeological Resources (continued)			<p>8. All cultural material collected during the grading monitoring program shall be processed and curated according to the current professional repository standards. The collections and associated records shall be transferred, including title, to an appropriate curation facility within San Diego County, to be accompanied by payment of the fees necessary for permanent curation.</p> <p>9. A report documenting the field and analysis results and interpreting the artifact and research data within the research context shall be completed and submitted to the satisfaction of the City prior to the issuance of any building permits. The report will include California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) Primary and Archaeological Site Forms.</p>	
Paleontological Resources	No impact	No impact	No mitigation required	No mitigation required
Human Remains	Less than significant	Less than significant	No mitigation required	No mitigation required
5.6 Geology and Soils				
Exposure to Seismic-related Hazards	Less than significant	Less than significant	No mitigation required	No mitigation required
Soil Erosion or Topsoil Loss	Less than significant	Less than significant	No mitigation required	No mitigation required

Table 1.1-1 Summary of Project Impacts

Issue Topic	Potential Direct Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	Mitigation Measures	Impact After Mitigation
Soil Stability	Potentially significant	Less than significant	<p>Geo-1 All recommendations contained in the geotechnical feasibility review shall be incorporated into the Project during construction. These recommendations include the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Transition lots shall be undercut at least 3 feet and at least one-third the maximum fill thickness on any lot, such that the ratio of 3:1 (maximum:minimum) fill thickness, or flatter is attained. Cut lots shall also be undercut to mitigate perched water conditions. All undercuts shall be sloped to drain away from the building area. 2. The fill cap shall extend to at least one foot below the lowest utility invert in street areas to facilitate trenching operations. 3. For fill slopes descending to property lines, removals shall be completed above a 1:1 projection beginning at the property line, or a point located at least 5 feet laterally from any adjacent street, or any nearby utility. Relatively deep removals adjacent to property line at Lots 3, 4, 43, 44, and Open Space Lot C may necessitate the use of structural setbacks within the building area, or possibly deepened foundations. 4. Any planned import soil shall be very low to low expansive. 	Less than significant

Table 1.1-1 Summary of Project Impacts

Issue Topic	Potential Direct Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	Mitigation Measures	Impact After Mitigation
Expansive Soils	Less than significant	Less than significant	No mitigation required	No mitigation required
Wastewater Disposal Systems	No impact	No impact	No mitigation required	No mitigation required
5.7 Greenhouse Gas Emissions				
Compliance with AB 32	Less than significant	Less than significant	No mitigation required	No mitigation required
Potential Effects of Global Change in Escondido Climate Action Plan	Less than significant	Less than significant	No mitigation required	No mitigation required
5.8 Hazards and Hazardous Materials				
Transport, Use, and Disposal of Hazardous Materials	Less than significant	Less than significant	No mitigation required	No mitigation required

Table 1.1-1 Summary of Project Impacts

Issue Topic	Potential Direct Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	Mitigation Measures	Impact After Mitigation
Accidental Release of Hazardous Materials	Potentially significant	Less than significant	<p>Haz-1 At least 10 days prior to demolition or removal of existing on-site structures, the project applicant shall submit an Asbestos Demolition or Renovation Operational Plan (<i>Notice of Intention</i>) to the City Community Development Department. This Plan shall be prepared by an asbestos consultant licensed with the California State Licensing Board and certified by the California Occupational Safety and Health Administration to conduct an asbestos inspection in compliance with Asbestos <i>National Emission Standard for Hazardous Air Pollutants</i> (NESHAP) requirements. The Asbestos NESHAP, as specified under Rule 40, CFR 61, Subpart M, (enforced locally by the San Diego Air Pollution Control District, under authority, per Regulation XI, Subpart M - Rule 361.145), requires the owner of an establishment set for demolition to submit an Asbestos Demolition or Renovation Operational Plan at least 10 working days before any asbestos stripping or removal work begins (such as site preparation that would break up, dislodge or similarly disturb asbestos containing material.)</p> <p>Removal of all asbestos-containing material or potential asbestos-containing material on the project site shall be monitored by the certified asbestos consultant and shall be performed in accordance with all applicable laws, including California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 1529, Asbestos; OSHA standards; and the San Diego County Air Pollution Control District Rule 361.145, Standard for Demolition and Renovation.</p>	Less than significant

Table 1.1-1 Summary of Project Impacts

Issue Topic	Potential Direct Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	Mitigation Measures	Impact After Mitigation
Accidental Release of Hazardous Materials (continued)			Haz-2 Demolition or removal of existing on-site structures constructed pre-1979 shall be performed by a Certified Lead Inspector/Assessor, as defined in Title 17, CCR Section 35005, and in accordance with all applicable laws pertaining to the handling and disposal of lead-based paint. Lead-based materials exposure is regulated by California Occupational Safety and Health Administration (Cal OSHA). Title 8 CCR Section 1532.1 requires testing, monitoring, containment, and disposal of lead-based materials such that exposure levels do not exceed Cal OSHA standards.	
Hazards to Schools	No impact	No impact	No mitigation required	No mitigation required

Table 1.1-1 Summary of Project Impacts

Issue Topic	Potential Direct Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	Mitigation Measures	Impact After Mitigation
Existing Hazardous Materials Sites	Potentially significant	Less than significant	<p>Haz-3 To address risks associated with the detected concentrations of TPH-DRO and arsenic, one of the following three remedial methods shall be implemented. Remedial Method Options 1, 2 and 3 would require soil export of up to approximately 1,353 cubic yards of soil.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Remedial Method Option 1 <u>Remedial Method:</u> Excavation and off-site disposal of TPH-impacted soil, approximately 20 cubic yards; and arsenic-impacted soil (AIS), approximately 1,333 cubic yards. <u>Overseeing Agencies:</u> California DTSC and San Diego DEH, along with California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) and RWQCB for portions of the project site near the creek. 2. Remedial Method Option 2 <u>Remedial Method:</u> Excavation and off-site disposal of TPH-impacted soil, approximately 20 cubic yards; and excavation and on-site burial of AIS, approximately 1,333 cubic yards. <u>Overseeing Agencies:</u> DTSC and DEH, along with CDFW and RWQCB for portions of the project site near the creek. 3. Remedial Method Option 3 <u>Remedial Method:</u> Excavation and off-site disposal of TPH-impacted soil, approximately 20 cubic yards; and capping of AIS with 800 cubic yards of soils (therefore, no excavation and off-site disposal of AIS is required). Capping is a process used to cover contaminated soils to prevent the migration of pollutants and is a reliable technology for sealing off contamination from the above-ground environment and significantly reducing underground migration of pollutants away from the site. The cap shall be made of soil native to the site. 	Less than significant

Table 1.1-1 Summary of Project Impacts

Issue Topic	Potential Direct Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	Mitigation Measures	Impact After Mitigation
Existing Hazardous Materials Sites (continued)			<p>Overseeing Agency: DTSC and DEH, along with CDFW and RWQCB for portions of the project site near the creek.</p> <p>Prior to issuance of a grading permit for the selected remedial method, any areas proposed for disturbance on the project site where previous hazardous materials releases have occurred must be mitigated in accordance with the requirements of the overseeing regulatory agency for the proposed residential use of the site. All proposed groundbreaking activities within areas of identified or suspected contamination shall be conducted according to a site-specific health and safety plan, prepared by a licensed professional in accordance with Cal OSHA regulations (contained in Title 8 of the California Code of Regulations) to protect the public and all workers in the construction area and approved by San Diego DEH prior to the commencement of groundbreaking.</p> <p>Following completion of the selected remedial method, the project applicant shall seek written regulatory closure letter from the DTSC or DEH specifying that no further action is necessary in regard to the TPH- and arsenic-impacted soil.</p> <p>Potential human health risk mitigation measures would include the installation of soil vapor barriers beneath proposed building structures to prevent soil vapor intrusion if the vapor levels exceed regulatory standards. Additionally, the pockets of soil impacted by petroleum hydrocarbons and/or by heavy metals at concentrations above regional background levels will be mitigated through a removal action with either on-site strategic placement to eliminate the exposure pathway or off-site disposal at a suitable landfill.</p>	

Table 1.1-1 Summary of Project Impacts

Issue Topic	Potential Direct Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	Mitigation Measures	Impact After Mitigation
Existing Hazardous Materials Sites (continued)			<p>Haz-4 During project construction, all areas within the project site containing contaminants at concentrations exceeding hazardous waste levels shall be mitigated by personnel who have been trained through the OSHA 40-hour safety program, in accordance with an approved plan for excavation, control of contaminant releases to the air, and off-site transport or on-site treatment.</p> <p>To monitor potential risks to on-site receptors arising from the presence of heavy metals in soil, air monitoring will be performed at the areas of the project site where soil will be disturbed. The results of the air monitoring will be compared to “Action Levels” based on OSHA Permissible Exposure Limits for heavy metals. If the results of the air monitoring indicate heavy metals in dust at concentrations at least 75 percent of the applicable Action Level, exposure risks will be controlled through the use of personal protective equipment by workers at the site to prevent their exposure to these contaminants. Such personal protective equipment will be specified in a site-specific health and safety plan.</p> <p>Air monitoring also will be performed downwind of the earth movement activities, at the boundaries of the site, to monitor potential risks to off-site receptors. If the results of the air monitoring indicate that heavy metal concentrations in dust exceed 75 percent of the applicable Action Level, the following dust mitigation measures will be employed: (1) water (or another non-hazardous agent) will be applied to exposed soil to prevent dust migration from arising during earth movement activities (e.g., excavation and/or grading); (2) water will be applied to stockpiled soil, which will be covered with plastic sheeting to prevent dust migration; and (3) during periods of high wind, earth movement activities will be discontinued until wind speeds decrease to speeds less than 25 miles per hour.</p>	

Table 1.1-1 Summary of Project Impacts

Issue Topic	Potential Direct Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	Mitigation Measures	Impact After Mitigation
Public Airports	No impact	No impact	No mitigation required	No mitigation required
Private Airports	No impact	No impact	No mitigation required	No mitigation required
Emergency Response and Evacuation Plans	Potentially significant	Less than significant	<i>Haz-5</i> Prior to the start of construction, the construction contractor shall notify the Escondido Police Department of the location, timing, and duration of any lane closure(s) on Felicita Road, or any other road in the project area, due to project construction activities. If determined necessary by the Police Department, local emergency services, including the Escondido Fire Department and appropriate ambulance services, shall also be notified of the lane closure(s).	Less than significant
Wildland Fires	Less than significant	Less than significant	No mitigation required	No mitigation required
5.9 Hydrology and Water Quality				
Water Quality Standards and Requirements	Less than significant	Less than significant	No mitigation required	No mitigation required
Groundwater Supplies and Recharge	Less than significant	Less than significant	No mitigation required	No mitigation required
Erosion or Siltation	Less than significant	Less than significant	No mitigation required	No mitigation required
Flooding	Less than significant	Less than significant	No mitigation required	No mitigation required
Exceed Capacity of Stormwater Systems	Less than significant	Less than significant	No mitigation required	No mitigation required
Otherwise Degrade Water Quality	Less than significant	Less than significant	No mitigation required	No mitigation required

Table 1.1-1 Summary of Project Impacts

Issue Topic	Potential Direct Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	Mitigation Measures	Impact After Mitigation
Housing within a Flood Hazard Area	Potentially significant	Less than significant	Hydro-1 A Letter of Map Revision (LOMR) certifying that all houses within the Project been elevated above the base flood level of the 100-year floodplain is required from the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). The Project is required to model stormwater flow through the channel system as part of final Project engineering to meet FEMA requirements.	Less than significant
Flow within a Flood Hazard Area	Potentially significant	Less than significant	Hydro-1 Refer to text above.	Less than significant
Dam Inundation and Flood Hazards	No impact	No impact	No mitigation required	No mitigation required
Seiche, Tsunami, and Mudflow Hazards	No impact	No impact	No mitigation required	No mitigation required
5.10 Land Use				
Physical Division of an Established Community	No impact	No impact	No mitigation required	No mitigation required
Conflicts with Land Use Plans, Policies, and Regulations	No impact	No impact	No mitigation required	No mitigation required
Conflicts with HCPs or NCCPs	Potentially significant	Potentially significant	Bio-1 through Bio-6	Less than significant
5.11 Noise				
Excessive Noise Levels	Less than significant	Less than significant	No mitigation required	No mitigation required
Excessive Groundborne Vibration	Potentially significant	Less than significant	Noi-1 Limit Vibration-generating Equipment. The construction contractor shall not operate a vibratory roller, or equipment with the potential to result in an equivalent level of vibration, within 75 feet of any residence.	Less than significant
Permanent Increase in Ambient Noise Levels	Less than significant	Less than significant	No mitigation required	No mitigation required

Table 1.1-1 Summary of Project Impacts

Issue Topic	Potential Direct Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	Mitigation Measures	Impact After Mitigation
Temporary Increase in Ambient Noise Levels	Potentially significant	Less than significant	<p>Noi-2 The construction contractor shall implement a noise mitigation plan to ensure that construction noise levels will not exceed an hourly average noise level of 75 dBA at any residence. The plan shall be verified by a qualified acoustical engineer and be subject to approval by the City Engineer. Measures to be included in the plan shall include the following, as necessary, to achieve compliance with the City's noise ordinance for construction within 140 feet of an off-site residential lot:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Equipment and trucks used for Project construction shall use the best available noise control techniques (e.g., improved mufflers, equipment redesign, use of intake silencers, ducts, engine enclosures and acoustically attenuating shields or shrouds). 2. Construction contractors shall use "quiet" gasoline-powered compressors or other electric-powered compressors, and use electric rather than gasoline or diesel powered forklifts for small lifting. 3. Stationary noise sources, such as temporary generators, shall be located as far from nearby receptors as possible, and they shall be muffled and enclosed within temporary sheds, incorporate insulation barriers, or other measures to the extent feasible. 4. Temporary plywood noise barriers eight feet in height shall be installed as needed around the construction site to minimize construction noise to 75 dBA as measured at the applicable property lines of the adjacent uses, unless an acoustical engineer submits documentation that confirms that the barriers are not necessary to achieve the attenuation levels. 	Less than significant
Excessive Noise Exposure from a Public Airport	No impact	No impact	No mitigation required	No mitigation required

Table 1.1-1 Summary of Project Impacts

Issue Topic	Potential Direct Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	Mitigation Measures	Impact After Mitigation
Excessive Noise Exposure from a Private Airstrip	No impact	No impact	No mitigation required	No mitigation required
5.12 Public Services				
Fire Protection Services	Less than significant	Less than significant	No mitigation required	No mitigation required
Police Protection Services	Less than significant	Less than significant	No mitigation required	No mitigation required
School Services	Less than significant	Less than significant	No mitigation required	No mitigation required
Park Services	Less than significant	Less than significant	No mitigation required	No mitigation required
Other Public Services	Less than significant	Less than significant	No mitigation required	No mitigation required
5.13 Recreation				
Deterioration of Parks and Recreational Facilities	Less than significant	Less than significant	No mitigation required	No mitigation required
Construction of New Recreational Facilities	No impact	No impact	No mitigation required	No mitigation required
5.14 Transportation and Traffic				
Traffic and Level of Service Standards	Less than significant	Less than significant	No mitigation required	No mitigation required
Air Traffic Patterns	No impact	No impact	No mitigation required	No mitigation required
Road Safety	No impact	No impact	No mitigation required	No mitigation required
Emergency Access	Potentially significant	Less than significant	Haz-5 Refer to text above under 5.8 Hazards and Hazardous Materials.	Less than significant
Alternative Transportation	Less than significant	Less than significant	No mitigation required	No mitigation required

Table 1.1-1 Summary of Project Impacts

Issue Topic	Potential Direct Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	Mitigation Measures	Impact After Mitigation
5.15 Utilities and Service Systems				
Wastewater Treatment Requirements	Less than significant	Less than significant	No mitigation required	No mitigation required
New Water and Wastewater Treatment Facilities	Potentially significant	Less than significant	Air-1, Air-3 Refer to text above under 5.3 Air Quality Bio-1 through Bio-6 Refer to text above under 5.4 Biological Resources Cul-1 Refer to text above under 5.5 Cultural Resources Geo-1 Refer to text above under 5.6 Geology and Soils Haz-1 through Haz-5 Refer to text above under 5.8 Hazards and Hazardous Materials Noi-1, Noi-2 Refer to text above under 5.11 Noise	Less than significant
Sufficient Stormwater Drainage Facilities	Potentially significant	Less than significant	Air-1, Air-3 Refer to text above under 5.3 Air Quality Bio-1 through Bio-6 Refer to text above under 5.4 Biological Resources Cul-1 Refer to text above under 5.5 Cultural Resources Geo-1 Refer to text above under 5.6 Geology and Soils Haz-1 through Haz-5 Refer to text above under 5.8 Hazards and Hazardous Materials Hydro-1 Refer to text above under 5.9 Hydrology and Water Quality Noi-1, Noi-2 Refer to text above under 5.11 Noise	Less than significant
Adequate Water Supplies	Less than significant	Less than significant	No mitigation required	No mitigation required
Adequate Wastewater Facilities	Less than significant	Less than significant	No mitigation required	No mitigation required
Sufficient Landfill Capacity	Less than significant	Less than significant	No mitigation required	No mitigation required
Solid Waste Regulations	No impact	No impact	No mitigation required	No mitigation required

Table 1.1-2 Comparison of Alternatives – Environmental Impacts

Issue Areas	Project		Alternatives to the Project with Mitigation			
	Without Mitigation	With Mitigation	No Project	Less Dense (20 Units)	Reduced Jurisdictional Habitat Impact (62 Units)	Reduced Residential Footprint (65 Units)
5.1 Aesthetics						
Scenic Vistas	LS	NM	▼	—	—	—
Scenic Resources	N	N	▼	—	—	—
Visual Character or Quality	LS	NM	▼	—	—	—
Lighting and Glare	LS	NM	▼	—	—	—
5.2 Agricultural Resources						
Direct Conversion of Agricultural Resources	LS	NM	▼	—	—	—
Land Use Conflicts	LS	NM	▼	—	—	—
Indirect Conversion of Agricultural Resources	LS	NM	▼	—	—	—
5.3 Air Quality						
Air Quality Plans	LS	NM	▼	▼	—	—
Air Quality Violations	PS	LS	▼	▼	—	—
Criteria Pollutant Increase	LS	NM	▼	▼	—	—
Sensitive Receptors	LS	NM	▼	▼	—	—
Objectionable Odors	LS	NM	▼	▼	—	—
5.4 Biological Resources						
Special Status Plant and Wildlife Species	PS	LS	▼	—	▼	—
Riparian Habitat and Other Sensitive Natural Communities	PS	LS	▼	—	▼	—
Federally Protected Wetlands	PS	LS	▼	—	▼	—

- ▲ Alternative is likely to result in greater impacts to issue when compared to Project.
- Alternative is likely to result in a similar impacts to issue when compared to Project.
- ▼ Alternative is likely to result in fewer impacts to issue when compared to Project.
- PS Potentially Significant Impact
- LS Less Than Significant Impact
- N No Impact
- NM No Mitigation Required



Table 1.1-2 Comparison of Alternatives – Environmental Impacts

Issue Areas	Project		Alternatives to the Project with Mitigation			
	Without Mitigation	With Mitigation	No Project	Less Dense (20 Units)	Reduced Jurisdictional Habitat Impact (62 Units)	Reduced Residential Footprint (65 Units)
Wildlife Movement Corridors and Nursery Sites	N	NM	▼	—	—	—
Local Policies and Ordinances	PS	LS	▼	—	—	—
Habitat Conservation Plan and NCCP	N	NM	▼	—	—	—
5 Cultural Resources						
Historical Resources	LS	NM	▼	—	—	—
Archaeological Resources	PS	LS	▼	—	—	—
Paleontological Resources	N	NM	▼	—	—	—
Human Remains	LS	NM	▼	—	—	—
5.6 Geology and Soils						
Exposure to Seismic-related Hazards	LS	NM	▼	—	—	—
Soil Erosion or Topsoil Loss	LS	NM	▼	▼	—	▼
Soil Stability	PS	LS	▼	▼	—	—
Expansive Soils	LS	NM	▼	▼	—	—
Wastewater Disposal Systems	N	NM	▼	▲	—	—

- ▲ Alternative is likely to result in greater impacts to issue when compared to Project.
 — Alternative is likely to result in a similar impacts to issue when compared to Project.
 ▼ Alternative is likely to result in fewer impacts to issue when compared to Project.
 PS Potentially Significant Impact
 LS Less Than Significant Impact
 N No Impact
 NM No Mitigation Required

Table 1.1-2 Comparison of Alternatives – Environmental Impacts

Issue Areas	Project		Alternatives to the Project with Mitigation			
	Without Mitigation	With Mitigation	No Project	Less Dense (20 Units)	Reduced Jurisdictional Habitat Impact (62 Units)	Reduced Residential Footprint (65 Units)
5.7 Greenhouse Gas Emissions						
Compliance with AB 32	LS	NM	▼	▼	—	—
Potential Effects of Global Change in Escondido Climate Action Plan	LS	NM	▼	▼	—	—
5.8 Hazards and Hazardous Materials						
Transport, Use, and Disposal of Hazardous Materials	LS	NM	▼	—	—	—
Accidental Release of Hazardous Materials	PS	LS	▼	—	—	—
Hazards to Schools	N	NM	▼	—	—	—
Existing Hazardous Materials Sites	PS	LS	▼	—	—	—
Public Airports	N	NM	▼	—	—	—
Private Airports	N	NM	▼	—	—	—
Emergency Response and Evacuation Plans	PS	LS	▼	▼	—	—
Wildland Fires	LS	NM	▼	—	—	—
5.9 Hydrology and Water Quality						
Water Quality Standards and Requirements	LS	NM	▲	—	—	—
Groundwater Supplies and Recharge	LS	NM	▼	—	—	—
Erosion or Siltation	LS	NM	▼	—	—	—
Flooding	LS	NM	▲	—	—	—
Exceed Capacity of Stormwater Systems	LS	NM	▲	—	—	—
Otherwise Degrade Water Quality	LS	NM	▼	—	—	—

- ▲ Alternative is likely to result in greater impacts to issue when compared to Project.
- Alternative is likely to result in a similar impacts to issue when compared to Project.
- ▼ Alternative is likely to result in fewer impacts to issue when compared to Project.
- PS Potentially Significant Impact
- LS Less Than Significant Impact
- N No Impact
- NM No Mitigation Required



Table 1.1-2 Comparison of Alternatives – Environmental Impacts

Issue Areas	Project		Alternatives to the Project with Mitigation			
	Without Mitigation	With Mitigation	No Project	Less Dense (20 Units)	Reduced Jurisdictional Habitat Impact (62 Units)	Reduced Residential Footprint (65 Units)
Housing within a Flood Hazard Area	PS	LS	▼	—	—	—
Flow within a Flood Hazard Area	PS	LS	▼	—	—	—
Dam Inundation and Flood Hazards	N	NM	▼	—	—	—
Seiche, Tsunami, and Mudflow Hazards	N	NM	▼	—	—	—
5.10 Land Use						
Physical Division of an Established Community	N	NM	▼	—	—	—
Conflicts with Land Use Plans, Policies, and Regulations	N	NM	▼	—	—	—
Conflicts with HCPs or NCCPs	PS	LS	▼	—	—	—
5.11 Noise						
Excessive Noise Levels	LS	NM	▼	—	—	—
Excessive Groundborne Vibration	PS	LS	▼	▼	—	—
Permanent Increase in Ambient Noise Levels	LS	NM	▼	▼	—	—
Temporary Increase in Ambient Noise Levels	PS	LS	▼	▼	—	—
Excessive Noise Exposure from a Public Airport	N	NM	▼	—	—	—
Excessive Noise Exposure from a Private Airstrip	N	NM	▼	—	—	—

- ▲ Alternative is likely to result in greater impacts to issue when compared to Project.
 — Alternative is likely to result in a similar impacts to issue when compared to Project.
 ▼ Alternative is likely to result in fewer impacts to issue when compared to Project.
 PS Potentially Significant Impact
 LS Less Than Significant Impact
 N No Impact
 NM No Mitigation Required

Table 1.1-2 Comparison of Alternatives – Environmental Impacts

Issue Areas	Project		Alternatives to the Project with Mitigation			
	Without Mitigation	With Mitigation	No Project	Less Dense (20 Units)	Reduced Jurisdictional Habitat Impact (62 Units)	Reduced Residential Footprint (65 Units)
5.12 Public Services						
Fire Protection Services	LS	NM	▼	▼	—	—
Police Protection Services	LS	NM	▼	▼	—	—
School Services	LS	NM	▼	▼	—	—
Park Services	LS	NM	▼	▼	—	—
Other Public Services	LS	NM	▼	▼	—	—
5.13 Recreation						
Deterioration of Parks and Recreational Facilities	LS	NM	▼	▼	—	—
Construction of New Recreational Facilities	N	NM	▼	▼	—	—
5.14 Transportation and Traffic						
Traffic and Level of Service Standards	LS	NM	▼	▼	—	—
Air Traffic Patterns	N	NM	—	—	—	—
Road Safety	N	NM	▼	▼	—	—
Emergency Access	PS	LS	▼	▼	—	—
Alternative Transportation	LS	NM	▼	—	—	—
5.15 Utilities and Service Systems						
Wastewater Treatment Requirements	LS	NM	▼	▼	—	—
New Water and Wastewater Treatment Facilities	PS	LS	▼	▼	—	—
Sufficient Stormwater Drainage Facilities	PS	LS	▼	▼	—	—
Adequate Water Supplies	LS	NM	▼	▼	—	—

- ▲ Alternative is likely to result in greater impacts to issue when compared to Project.
- Alternative is likely to result in a similar impacts to issue when compared to Project.
- ▼ Alternative is likely to result in fewer impacts to issue when compared to Project.
- PS Potentially Significant Impact
- LS Less Than Significant Impact
- N No Impact
- NM No Mitigation Required



Table 1.1-2 Comparison of Alternatives – Environmental Impacts

Issue Areas	Project		Alternatives to the Project with Mitigation			
	Without Mitigation	With Mitigation	No Project	Less Dense (20 Units)	Reduced Jurisdictional Habitat Impact (62 Units)	Reduced Residential Footprint (65 Units)
Adequate Wastewater Facilities	LS	NM	▼	▼	—	—
Sufficient Landfill Capacity	LS	NM	▼	▼	—	—
Solid Waste Regulations	N	NM	▼	▼	—	—

- ▲ Alternative is likely to result in greater impacts to issue when compared to Project.
- Alternative is likely to result in a similar impacts to issue when compared to Project.
- ▼ Alternative is likely to result in fewer impacts to issue when compared to Project.
- PS Potentially Significant Impact
- LS Less Than Significant Impact
- N No Impact
- NM No Mitigation Required

