

---

## **6.0 Mandatory CEQA Topics**

## 6.0 MANDATORY CEQA TOPICS

### 6.1 EFFECTS FOUND NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT

This section evaluates those environmental effects that were found not to be significant as part of the Initial Study preparation process. Based on analysis conducted as part of this EIR, implementation of the proposed project would result in no significant impacts with regard to the following issues: agricultural resources, mineral resources, population/housing, public services, recreation, utilities/service systems, and transportation/traffic. These conclusions were aided in part through technical analysis conducted by independent consultants and documented in reports appended to this EIR for reference. A more detailed analysis related to why these issues have been determined not to be significant through the EIR process is provided below.

#### 6.1.1 AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

Information on agricultural resources in the following section was obtained from the California Department of Conservation's web site ([www.consrv.ca.gov](http://www.consrv.ca.gov)).

##### **A. EXISTING CONDITIONS**

The project site consists of 47.81 acres, most of which comprises vacant, undeveloped land. Although the project site historically has supported agricultural activities, a review of historical aerial photographs for the site indicates that agricultural activities on the site ceased operation sometime between 1960, when several agricultural rows of trees are visible in aerial photos, and 1967, when the site appears vacant and the agricultural rows of trees are no longer apparent.

Within the State of California, the Department of Conservation provides information, maps, funding, and technical assistance to local governments, consultants, Resource Conservation Districts, and non-profit organizations to conserve the state's agricultural and natural resources. The Department of Conservation tracks data and maps on the amount of farmland available in the state, and provides this information as part of the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP). The proposed project site is designated by the State Department of Conservation FMMP as containing "Other Land" and "Farmland of Local Importance."

##### **B. GUIDELINES FOR THE DETERMINATION OF SIGNIFICANCE**

Significant adverse impacts to agricultural resources would occur if the proposed project would:

1. *Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland) as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP) of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use.*
2. *Conflict with existing agricultural use, or a Williamson Act (agricultural preserve) contract.*
3. *Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use.*

**C. ANALYSIS OF PROJECT EFFECTS AND DETERMINATION OF SIGNIFICANCE**

***Issue 1:*** *Would the proposed project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland) as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP) of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?*

The proposed project site is designated by the State Department of Conservation FMMP as containing “Other Land” and “Farmland of Local Importance.” The proposed project site does not contain land mapped by the FMMP as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. Therefore, a significant impact resulting from the conversion of Prime, Unique, or Statewide Important Farmland types would not occur.

***Issue 2:*** *Would the proposed project conflict with existing agricultural use, or a Williamson Act (agricultural preserve) contract?*

The proposed project site is not located within an Agricultural Preserve and is not under a Williamson Act contract. Although the project site historically has supported agricultural activities, a review of historical aerial photographs for the site indicates that agricultural activities on the site ceased operation sometime between 1960 and 1967. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not conflict with any existing agricultural uses or Williamson Act contracts, and a significant impact would not occur.

***Issue 3:*** *Would the proposed project involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?*

Areas to the west of the proposed project site are constrained by steep topography which would preclude agricultural activities. Areas located to the east and north of the proposed project site are constrained by existing wetland resources which are not conducive to agricultural activities. Lands to the southeast and south of the project site are currently being developed in association with a proposed senior housing facility. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not involve changes to the existing environment which would result in the conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use.

**6.1.2 MINERAL RESOURCES**

Information on mineral resources is based on a publication from the California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, entitled, “*Update of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San Diego County Production-Consumption Region*” (1996).

**A. EXISTING CONDITIONS**

According to the California Department of Conservation, the proposed project site is located within the “MRZ-3” Mineral Resource Zone. Areas designated as “MRZ-3” indicates that there are no known mineral resources in the project vicinity. In addition, Figure 4 of the Mineral Land Classification report shows the locations of permitted aggregate mines and does not depict any active aggregate mines in the project vicinity. The proposed project site does not contain any historic mine sites, and no mining is proposed on the property.

**B. GUIDELINES FOR THE DETERMINATION OF SIGNIFICANCE**

Significant adverse impacts to energy and mineral resources would occur if the proposed project would:

1. *Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource in an area classified or designated by the State that would be of value to the region or the residents of the State.*
2. *Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan.*
3. *Be an incompatible land use located adjacent to a State classified or designated area or existing surface mine.*
4. *Expose people or property to hazards from proposed, existing or abandoned quarries or mines.*

**C. ANALYSIS OF PROJECT EFFECTS AND DETERMINATION OF SIGNIFICANCE**

***Issue 1:*** *Would the proposed project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource in an area classified or designated by the State that would be of value to the region or the residents of the State?*

According to the California Department of Conservation, the proposed project site is located within the “MRZ-3” Mineral Resource Zone, which indicates that there are no known mineral resources in the project vicinity. Accordingly, implementation of the proposed project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource, as the subject property is not classified or designated by the State as containing mineral resources that would be of value to the region or the residents of the State. For these reasons, no impact would occur.

***Issue 2:*** *Would the proposed project result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?*

The project site is designated for development with Residential land uses by the City’s General Plan and Zoning Ordinance. Due to the project’s lack of known mineral resources (as indicated above), development of the project would not result in the loss of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site.

***Issue 3:*** *Would the proposed project be an incompatible land use located adjacent to a State classified or designated area or existing surface mine?*

According to the California Department of Conservation Mineral Land Classification report (1996), the area surrounding the proposed project site is designated as a “MRZ-3” Mineral Resource Zone, which indicates that there are no known mineral resources in the project vicinity. In addition, Figure 4 of the Mineral Land Classification report shows the locations of permitted aggregate mines, and does not depict any active aggregate mines in the project vicinity. Accordingly, implementation of the proposed project would not result in the establishment of an incompatible land use located adjacent to a State classified or designated area or existing surface mine.

***Issue 4:*** *Would the proposed project expose people or property to hazards from proposed, existing, or abandoned quarries or mines?*

The proposed project site does not contain any historic mine sites, and no mining is proposed on the property. The project would not expose people or property to proposed, existing, or abandoned quarries or mines because these uses do not exist on or adjacent to the property.

### **6.1.3 POPULATION/HOUSING**

The following section is based on a review of aerial photography (2004) and the Housing Element of the Encinitas General Plan.

#### **A. EXISTING CONDITIONS**

The project site is currently vacant, and no structures exist on the site. Surrounding residential development includes Green Valley, a proposed senior housing facility (currently under construction) located southeast of the project. Located to the west and southwest of the proposed project site are several natural bluffs and open space land uses. Land uses located atop these bluffs include an existing single-family residential neighborhood.

#### **B. GUIDELINES FOR THE DETERMINATION OF SIGNIFICANCE**

Significant adverse impacts to population/housing would occur if the proposed project would:

- 1. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.*
- 2. Create a demand for additional housing, particularly housing affordable to households earning 80% or less of the County's median income.*
- 3. Affect a City Redevelopment Project Area.*
- 4. Cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections.*
- 5. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure).*

#### **C. ANALYSIS OF PROJECT EFFECTS AND DETERMINATION OF SIGNIFICANCE**

***Issue 1:*** *Would the proposed project displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?*

No existing occupied housing is located on the property; therefore, the proposed project would not displace existing housing.

***Issue 2:*** *Would the proposed project create a demand for additional housing, particularly housing affordable to households earning 80% or less of the County's median income?*

As required by EMC Chapter 24.21, *Dedication: Affordable Housing Assistance*, the project would be conditioned to provide for either 10% of on-site units at a rate affordable to tenants qualified by the County Housing Authority as meeting Section 8 Rental Assistance Requirements, or shall be

required to pay an equivalent in-lieu fee. Currently, the City of Encinitas does not have an established in-lieu fee program. Accordingly, the project would comply with City affordable housing requirements by providing two of the 19 units as affordable, pursuant to the requirements of EMC Chapter 24.21, and would not create any additional demand for low income housing.

***Issue 3: Would the proposed project affect a City Redevelopment Project Area?***

The proposed project is not located within a Redevelopment Area.

***Issue 4: Would the proposed project cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?***

***Issue 5: Would the proposed project induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?***

The proposed project would be developed in compliance with the City's General Plan land use designation of Rural Residential 1 (RR-1). Based on information available from the U.S. Census Bureau, the project is anticipated to generate approximately 48 new residents within the City, which would not represent a substantial increase in the City's population. Therefore, the proposed project would not cumulatively exceed population or housing growth projections beyond that which is already planned by the City and projected by the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG), and a significant impact would not occur.

#### **6.1.4 PUBLIC SERVICES**

The following section is based on information from the San Diego County General Plan Safety Element, City of Encinitas Website ([www.ci.encinitas.ca.us](http://www.ci.encinitas.ca.us)), EMC Chapter 23.92, and correspondence with the Encinitas Fire Station (March 13, 2006), the San Diego County Sheriff's Department (February 10, 2006), the San Dieguito Union High School District (February 3, 2006), and the Encinitas Union School District (March 8, 2006). A copy of all correspondence received from these agencies is included in the Technical Appendices to this EIR under Section O.

#### **A. EXISTING CONDITIONS**

The proposed project site is served by the Encinitas Fire Protection District for fire, the San Diego Sheriff's Department for police protection services, the Encinitas Union School District (EUSD) for elementary school services, and the San Dieguito High School District (SDHSD) for junior high and high school services. In addition, regional medical services are provided by the Scripps Memorial Hospital, while library services are provided by both the Encinitas Community Library and the Carlsbad City Library (South).

#### **B. GUIDELINES FOR THE DETERMINATION OF SIGNIFICANCE**

Significant adverse impacts to public services would occur if the proposed project would:

- 1. Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for public services?*

**C. ANALYSIS OF PROJECT EFFECTS AND DETERMINATION OF SIGNIFICANCE**

***Issue 1:*** *Would the proposed project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for public services?*

 **Fire Services**

The proposed project site is served by the Encinitas Fire Protection District, which serves the entire City limits along with additional territory in a defined sphere of influence. The nearest fire station to the site is the Carlsbad Fire Department Fire Station 2, located at 1906 Arenal Road. Secondary service would be provided by Encinitas Fire Station 3, which is located at 801 Orpheus Avenue.

The proposed project is consistent with the residential land use designation assigned to the site by the City of Encinitas' General Plan. Emergency planning by both the City of Encinitas and City of Carlsbad accounts for the proposed residential uses at the site, and project implementation would not result in the need for new or physically altered fire facilities. In addition, project implementation would not adversely affect service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives.

As with all new development, implementation of the proposed project would incrementally increase the demand for fire services. As a standard condition of approval, and as required by EMC Chapter 29.32, *Fire Mitigation Fee*, the proposed project would be required to contribute a fire mitigation fee to provide funding to help finance the cost of additional fire protection facilities and services as the need arises. These fees would be assessed at the time of application for a building permit. The fire mitigation fee currently is \$322 per dwelling unit, although this amount could change prior to application for building permits. With payment of the Fire Mitigation Fee, the project's increased demand on fire services and facilities would be reduced to a level less than significant.

 **Sheriff Services**

According to information provided by the San Diego County Sheriff's Department, the proposed project site is serviced by the Encinitas Patrol Station, located 2.7 miles from the site at 175 North El Camino Real. The Encinitas Patrol Station is staff by approximately ten patrol units per 24-hour period, and the estimated response time to a Priority One call is 5.9 minutes.

Any new development, including the development proposed by the project, would incrementally increase the demand for sheriff services due to the potential for an increase in criminal activity such as burglaries, thefts, auto thefts, vandalism, etc. The incremental increase in demand resulting from project development of 19 residential homes would not result in an unanticipated or undue burden upon response times for emergency services because development of the project is proposed to occur in accordance with planned growth anticipated by the City's General Plan. The project would not result in the need to construct a new sheriff's station or physically alter an existing station.

 **Schools**

The proposed project would consist of 19 single-family residential homes and would be served by the San Dieguito Union High School District (SDUHSD) for junior high and high school, and by the Encinitas Union School District (EUSD) for elementary school. Based on information available from the EUSD website, the proposed project would generate approximately 5 elementary school

students. Based on information provided by the SDUHSD, the proposed project is expected to result in 2 new junior high school students and 3 new high school students.

As shown in Table 6-1, *School Enrollment, Capacity, and Generation*, based on existing capacity and the projected number of students that would be generated by the proposed project, the project's students would not exceed the existing capacity of any schools that would serve the site. As a standard requirement, the project applicant also would be required to contribute fees towards the provision of new school facilities, in accordance with California Education Code Sections 17072.10-17072.18. Therefore, because the project would not exceed the capacity at any existing schools, and because school fees would be required pursuant to SB 50, project implementation would not result in the need for new or expanded junior or high school facilities.

**Table 6-1 SCHOOL ENROLLMENT, CAPACITY, AND GENERATION**

SCHOOL/DISTRICT	CAPACITY <sup>1</sup> (STUDENTS)	ENROLLMENT <sup>1</sup>	EXCESS CAPACITY	PROJECT-GENERATED # OF STUDENTS <sup>2</sup>
La Costa Elementary School/EUSD	683	632	51 students	5
Diegueño Middle School/SDUHSD	1,102	963	139 students	2
La Costa Canyon High School/SDUHSD	2,802	2,647	155 students	3

1. Enrollment and Capacity for the EUSD is based on the 2003-04 school year, while enrollment for the SDUHSD is based on the 2005-06 school year.
2. Generation rates are based on information provided by the SDUHSD and by information available on the EUSD website.

**Libraries**

The project is anticipated to generate approximately 48 new residents within the City. Accordingly, project implementation would incrementally increase the demand for library services within the City of Encinitas and surrounding areas.

The proposed project would be consistent with the General Plan's residential land use designation applied to the site, and would be consistent with population projections made in conjunction with long-range public facility planning efforts by both the City of Carlsbad and City of Encinitas. Moreover, on January 11, 2006, the City of Encinitas adopted a new Community Facilities Impact fee, a portion of which will be used towards the construction costs of the proposed Encinitas Branch Library. The fee went into effect on March 13, 2006, and the proposed project would be required to pay this fee as a standard condition of project approval. With payment of the Community Facilities Impact Fee (\$571 per unit), the proposed project's impacts on library facilities would be reduced to below a level of significance, and project implementation would not result in the need to construct new library facilities or the need to physically alter an existing library facility.

**Health Services**

Adverse impacts to public health services are not anticipated as a result of implementation of the proposed project. The increase in population resulting from the project would generate an increased demand for medical services, but the project would not result in the need to construct a new public health facility. Health care is a regional issue, which generally responds to the current demand. The impact is thus considered less than significant.

### 6.1.5 RECREATION

The following section is based on information from the City of Encinitas General Plan, the U.S. Census Bureau, EMC Chapter 23.98, Encinitas City Council Resolution 2005-68, and the Encinitas General Plan Recreation Element, Figure 3, *Recreational Trails Master Plan Map*.

#### A. EXISTING CONDITIONS

The City of Encinitas contains a wide variety of parks, open spaces, and active and passive recreational opportunities. Several parks are located within the project vicinity. Scott Valley Park is located 1.1 miles southeast of the project site and features amenities such as play equipment, picnic facilities, and a basketball and volleyball court. Leo Mullen Sports Park is located 1.3 miles south of the project site and features amenities such as a trailhead, handicap access, play equipment, picnic facilities, restrooms, a basketball half-court, a soccer field, and a baseball field. Another park, Levante Park, is located 1.5 miles northeast of the project site.

Additionally, the major segment of the Indian Head Canyon Trail is 0.4-mile east of the project site. This recreational trail is nearly 2.97 miles long and can be used by hikers, bicyclists, and equestrians.

#### B. GUIDELINES FOR THE DETERMINATION OF SIGNIFICANCE

Significant adverse impacts to recreation would occur if the proposed project would:

1. *Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.*
2. *Include the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated.*
3. *Adversely impact recreation trails.*

#### C. ANALYSIS OF PROJECT EFFECTS AND DETERMINATION OF SIGNIFICANCE

***Issue 1:*** *Would the proposed project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?*

***Issue 2:*** *Would the proposed project include the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?*

The proposed project would consist of 19 single-family residential homes and open space land uses, but does not propose to construct any recreational facilities on-site. Implementation of the proposed project is estimated to increase the population of the City by approximately 48 residents, and would thereby incrementally increase the demand on existing park and recreation facilities. EMC Chapter 23.98, *Parkland Acquisition and Improvements*, provides specific standards for parkland dedications and improvements required of new developments. The purpose of the ordinance is to ensure that the goals and objectives of the General Plan Recreation Element are implemented. EMC Chapter 23.98 requires that subdivisions containing 50 parcels or less only shall be required to pay fees and not dedicate areas on-site for recreational purposes. As a standard condition of project approval, the proposed project would be conditioned to pay in-lieu park fees which would be used towards the expansion or creation of parkland facilities in the City.

Because the proposed project consists only of 19 dwelling units and is consistent with the City's General Plan Land Use Plan residential designation for the site, project implementation would not result in the need for new or expanded parkland facilities beyond those that have already been planned for within the City. In addition, project implementation would not substantially accelerate the deterioration of existing regional or neighborhood park facilities. The impact is therefore considered less than significant.

***Issue 3: Would the proposed project create any adverse impacts to recreational trails?***

Figure 3 of the General Plan Recreation Element depicts existing and proposed recreational trails within the City limits. According to Figure 3, there are no proposed trails within the project area. A segment of Indian Head Canyon Trail is located east of the project site; however, this segment is within the City of Carlsbad. The City of Encinitas considers this segment to meet the intent of the General Plan Recreation Element. Therefore, the proposed project does not need to provide a recreational trail and a significant impact would not occur.

### **6.1.6 UTILITIES/SERVICE SYSTEMS**

The following section is based on the OMWD 2005 Urban Water Management Plan, the Leucadia Wastewater District Website ([www.lcwwd.org](http://www.lcwwd.org)), the Encina Wastewater Authority Website ([www.encinajpa.com](http://www.encinajpa.com)), the Olivenhain Municipal Water District website ([www.olivenhain.com](http://www.olivenhain.com)), the Leucadia Wastewater District website ([www.lwwd.org](http://www.lwwd.org)), and the San Diego County Integrated Waste Management Plan (San Diego County, September 21, 2005)

#### **A. EXISTING CONDITIONS**

##### **Water Service and Supply**

The Olivenhain Municipal Water District (OMWD) administers the provision of water in the project area. As of January 2005, there were 23,429 service connections within the OMWD serving an estimated population of 58,000 residents. The OMWD Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP), which is the agency's long-term water planning document, was most recently updated on December 29, 2005. Included in the UWMP is detailed information about OMWD's estimated water demand, supply, and reliability for the next 25 years. OMWD considers planned land uses in its water supply projections.

##### **Sewer Services**

The Leucadia Wastewater District (LWD) administers the collection and treatment of wastewater in the project area. The LWD covers a total service area of 16 square miles, provides services to approximately 60,000 residents, and handles about 4 million gallons of wastewater daily. The LWD recently upgraded the Leucadia Pump Station, located approximately 0.2 miles northeast of the project site.

##### **Solid Waste Collection and Disposal**

The City of Encinitas has an exclusive franchise agreement with EDCO Waste and Recycling Services to provide solid waste collection services in Encinitas for both residential and commercial customers. EDCO is the only authorized company that can haul solid waste in the City of Encinitas.

Allied Waste Industries, Inc. operates solid waste facilities, including four (4) active Class III sanitary landfills at Sycamore, Otay, Ramona and Borrego, and seven (7) rural bin sites transfer stations. Each of the Class III landfills is at least 20 miles from the project site.

The California Integrated Waste Management Act (AB 939) was approved in 1989 due to the trend of an increased waste stream and decrease in landfill capacity. As a result of AB 939, the California Integrated Waste Management Board was established and a reporting program was instituted. AB 939 mandates a reduction of waste being disposed. The County Integrated Waste Management Plan includes programs to reduce the quantities of waste being sent to landfills. The City of Encinitas requires that waste haulers in the City implement recycling collection.

**Utilities**

The project site is within the service boundaries of San Diego Gas and Electric (SDG&E) for electricity and gas service, and Pacific Bell for communication system service.

**B. GUIDELINES FOR THE DETERMINATION OF SIGNIFICANCE**

Significant adverse impacts to utility and service systems would occur if the proposed project would:

1. *Require or result in the construction of new water treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects.*
2. *Not have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or if new or expanded entitlements are needed.*
3. *Require or result in the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities, including septic systems, or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects.*
4. *Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may service the project that it does not have adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments.*
5. *Not be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs.*
6. *Not comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid wastes (including the CIWMP [County Integrated Waste Management Plan]).*
7. *Impact the facilities requiring or resulting in the construction of new facilities or the expansion of existing facilities; the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.*

**C. ANALYSIS OF PROJECT EFFECTS AND DETERMINATION OF SIGNIFICANCE**

***Issue 1: Would the proposed project require or result in the construction of new water treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects?***

The project would generate the need for expanded water services from the Olivenhain Municipal Water District (OMWD). The project proposes to install water lines on-site and to connect to a proposed 8-inch water line within Rush Rose Street, which is currently under construction as part of the adjacent “Green Valley” residential project. The proposed connection would be constructed as part of the proposed project with an 8-inch water line within an on-site 20-foot utility easement located along the eastern project boundary. Where appropriate, the analysis contained in this EIR has accounted for all impacts associated with the construction of the proposed 8-inch water line on-site. The 8-inch water line associated with the Green Valley development would have adequate capacity to service the site with domestic water, and the project would not require the construction of new off-site water facilities. The impact is therefore considered less than significant.

***Issue 2: Would the proposed project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?***

The proposed project site has been designated for the development of rural residential land uses since adoption of the Encinitas General Plan in 1989, and the proposed use is considered in the OMWD’s water demand projections. The 2005 UWMP documents that sufficient water supplies are available to service projected demand. Therefore, no new or expanded entitlements are needed to service the proposed project with domestic water, and the impact is considered less than significant.

***Issue 3: Would the proposed project require or result in the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities, including septic systems, or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects?***

The project would place an incremental demand on LWD for sewer collection and treatment services. The project proposes to install on-site sewer lines for its 19 residential homes. A 6-inch sewer line would be constructed on-site by the proposed project within an on-site 20-foot wide utility easement. The 6-inch line would connect to an 8-inch sewer line located the right-of-way of Rush Rose Street that is currently being construction as part of the Green Valley Master Plan development immediately south and east of the proposed development. Grading operations for Rush Rose Street already have been completed. Where appropriate, the analysis contained in this EIR has accounted for all impacts associated with the construction of the proposed 6-inch sewer line on-site. The proposed on-site 6-inch sewer line to be constructed by the project and the off-site 8-inch sewer line under construction by the Green Valley project will have adequate capacity to collect and transport wastewater from the project and the construction of new off-site sewer facilities would not be needed. The impact is less than significant.

***Issue 4: Would the proposed project result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may service the project that it does not have adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?***

LWD is one of 6 members of the Encinitas Wastewater Authority (EWA), which operates a regional wastewater treatment and disposal facility in Carlsbad. The Encina treatment facility is recently upgraded and has a capacity of 36 million gallons per day (mgd) for wastewater treatment. Currently, the EWA estimates that it treats approximately 25 mgd per day. Although project

implementation would incrementally increase the demand for wastewater treatment at the Encina treatment facility, the facility currently has more than adequate capacity to serve the proposed project in addition to its existing commitments; therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

***Issue 5: Is the project served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?***

In 2005, the County of San Diego adopted an updated Integrated Waste Management Plan (IWMP) to address solid waste needs throughout the County. As per state requirements, the IWMP is required to provide for a Siting Element that must demonstrate at least 15 years of remaining disposal capacity. A combination of strategies is described in the Siting Element, including existing, proposed and tentative landfills or expansions, increased diversion efforts, and out-of-county transport of solid waste. The IWMP concludes that the strategies identified in the plan will be sufficient to meet solid waste demands in the County for the next 15 years. Implementation of the project would not result in exceeding permitted landfill capacities and impacts would be less than significant.

***Issue 6: Would the proposed project comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid wastes (including the County Integrated Waste Management Plan)?***

The project would be required to work with its refuse hauler to proceed with collection of recyclable products on a regular schedule. With required participation in curbside recycling efforts, impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance.

***Issue 7: Issue 7: Would the proposed project impact facilities requiring or resulting in the construction of new facilities or the expansion of existing facilities; the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?***

The proposed project is within the service boundaries of San Diego Gas and Electric (SDG&E) for electricity and gas service, and Pacific Bell for communication system service. These utilities are available adjacent to the site and connections to the service lines would not require physical impacts beyond the boundaries of the project's disturbance area footprint or adjacent roadway rights-of-way; therefore, the impact is less than significant.

Stormwater discharge from the proposed project site would not increase with development of the proposed project (with implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.4-1.A). Discharge from the site would be conveyed by an existing concrete brow ditch and the bladed swale and through one of two existing 24-inch RCP pipes or an existing triple box culvert. Accordingly, project implementation would not require the construction or expansion of stormwater drainage facilities.

Street lighting installed by the project would not cause physical impacts beyond the boundaries of the project's disturbance area footprint or adjacent roadway rights-of-way.

All roads proposed by the project would be constructed on-site and would be maintained as private facilities. A deceleration lane is proposed along the eastbound portion of La Costa Avenue west of the site, but improvements to this road would occur either on-site, or within the existing paved portions of La Costa Avenue. Where appropriate, impacts associated with the on-site construction of the deceleration lane have been accounted for throughout this document, and the impact is considered less than significant.

No other known government services would be adversely affected by development of the project.

The proposed project would not be regarded as an energy-intensive land use and as such, would not result in a conflict with adopted energy conservation plans. Development would be required to comply with Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations regarding energy efficiency.

**6.1.7 TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION**

The following traffic impact assessment is based on a technical report entitled, *Batiquitos Bluffs Draft Impact Analysis*, prepared by LOS Engineering, with assistance from Investigative Science and Engineering, Inc., dated August 22, 2005. For reference purposes, a copy of this report is contained in the Technical Appendices to this EIR under Section K.

**A. EXISTING CONDITIONS**

Regionally, access to the project site is provided by Interstate 5, which provides vehicle access to the north and south. According to the project’s traffic engineer, the only roadways and intersections that could experience potential impacts from the proposed project are La Costa Avenue, El Camino Real, and Saxony Road.

Table 6-2, *Existing Daily Roadway Segment Conditions*, summarizes the existing levels of service for each roadway segment. As depicted in Table 6-2, all roadway segments within the study area currently operate at LOS A.

**Table 6-2 EXISTING DAILY ROADWAY SEGMENT CONDITIONS**

ROADWAY SEGMENT	LANE CAPACITY	NUMBER OF LANES	TOTAL PEAK HOUR CAPACITY	EXISTING		
				Peak Hour Volume	V/C Ratio	LOS
La Costa Avenue to Saxony (Eastbound)	1,800	2	3,600	1,271	0.35	A
La Costa Avenue to El Camino Real (Westbound)	1,800	2	3,600	1,192	0.33	A

Table 6-3, *Existing Peak Hour Intersection Conditions*, summarizes the existing peak hour operating conditions for the intersections within the study area. The peak hour volumes for study area intersections are depicted on Table 6-6. As shown in Table 6-6, all study area intersections currently operate at LOS C or better during both peak hours.

**Table 6-3 EXISTING PEAK HOUR INTERSECTION CONDITIONS**

INTERSECTION	AM PEAK HOUR		PM PEAK HOUR	
	V/C RATIO	LOS	V/C RATIO	LOS
El Camino Real at La Costa Avenue (S)	0.73	C	0.75	C
Saxony Road at La Costa Avenue (S)	0.69	B	0.73	C
Project Driveway at La Costa Avenue (U)	DNE	DNE	DNE	DNE

Notes: S: Signalized; U: Unsignalized; DNE: Does Not Exist; V/C: Volume to Capacity; LOS: Level of Service

**B. GUIDELINES FOR DETERMINATION OF SIGNIFICANCE**

Significant adverse impacts to traffic/transportation would occur if the proposed project would:

1. *Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections).*
2. *Result in inadequate parking capacity.*
3. *Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated road or highways.*
4. *Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks.*
5. *Alter waterborne, rail or air traffic.*
6. *Substantially increase hazards to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment).*
7. *Cause an effect upon, or a need for new or altered maintenance of roads.*
8. *Cause an effect upon circulation during the project's construction.*
9. *Result in inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses.*
10. *Conflict with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g. bus turnouts, bicycle racks).*
11. *Conflict with bike trails.*

**C. ANALYSIS OF PROJECT EFFECTS AND DETERMINATION OF SIGNIFICANCE**

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

A project-specific traffic impact analysis was prepared for the proposed project, which analyzes the effect on surrounding roadways and intersections of constructing 20 single-family residential homes on the site. Because only 19 units are proposed by the project, the analysis assesses a “worst-case” scenario for impacts to traffic. As part of the scope of the traffic study, a study area was established which includes road segments and intersections likely to be impacted by the proposed project, as follows:

Intersections

- La Costa Avenue at Saxony Road
- La Costa Avenue at El Camino Real
- La Costa Avenue at project driveway

Road Segments

- La Costa Avenue between Saxony and El Camino Real (eastbound)
- La Costa Avenue between Saxony and El Camino Real (westbound)

The study indicates that the proposed project would generate approximately 200 average daily trips with 16 vehicles per hour during AM peak hour (5 inbound and 11 outbound), and 20 vehicles per hour during PM peak hour (14 inbound and 6 outbound).

According to the General Plan Circulation Element, the City attempts to maintain a level of service (LOS) C as a basic design guideline for roadways in the City, while development which results in a LOS E or F at any intersection is prohibited.

According to the project-specific traffic impact analysis, in the near-term scenario (i.e., upon construction of the proposed project) all study area intersections are projected to operate at a Level of Service (LOS) C or better. In addition, all study area road segments are projected to operate at LOS A. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not result in significant impacts to road segments or intersections in the near-term

In addition to the near-term conditions, the project-specific traffic impact analysis assesses the impact of the proposed project when combined with cumulative traffic in the area. According to the analysis, all study area intersections are anticipated to operate at LOS C or better, and all study area roadway segments are anticipated to operate at LOS A. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not result in significant impacts to road segments or intersections in the long-term.

Accordingly, implementation of the proposed project would not cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system.

***Issue 2: Would the proposed project result in inadequate parking capacity?***

EMC Section 30.54.030, *Schedule of Required Off-Street Parking*, specifies the amount of parking required of new developments in the City. A total of 3 parking spaces would be required for each dwelling unit proposed by the project, resulting in a total requirement of 57 spaces. Project compliance with EMC Section 30.54.030 would be assured through the Department of Planning and Building review of the proposed development plans, and a significant impact would not occur.

***Issue 3: Would the proposed project exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated road or highways?***

The San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) has prepared a state-mandated Congestion Management Plan (CMP) to monitor roadway congestion and assess the overall the performance of the region's transportation system. Based upon this assessment, the CMP contains specific strategies and improvements to reduce traffic congestion and improve the performance of a multi-modal transportation system. The CMP assesses planned land uses throughout the various jurisdictions in the region, and identifies long-range solutions for addressing regional traffic problems. The proposed project, which consists of 19 single-family residential homes, is consistent with the General Plan Land Use Plan designation of the site for rural residential uses. Because the proposed project would be consistent with the General Plan, which forms the basis for the various strategies of the CMP, the proposed project would be consistent with the CMP by default.

Additionally, as described above under “Issue 1,” all study area intersections would continue to operate at LOS C or better, and all study area roadway segments are anticipated to operate at LOS A. Based on the project’s consistency with the General and with the City of Carlsbad thresholds for significance, the addition of project traffic to the existing roadway network would not result in a significant impact to CMP designated roads or highways.

***Issue 4: Would the proposed project result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?***

***Issue 5: Would the proposed project alter waterborne, rail or air traffic?***

The proposed project does not have an air travel component, and none of the proposed structures would impede existing airborne operations. The project would therefore not result in a change to air traffic patterns. The proposed project would not alter waterborne, rail, or air traffic because the proposed project would not utilize waterborne, rail, or air modes of travel. Therefore, a significant impact would not occur.

***Issue 6: Would the proposed project substantially increase hazards to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment)?***

The project would not introduce any hazardous design features such as sharp curves or dangerous intersections to the project site or surrounding vicinity. The project would provide access through a right-in/right-out driveway on La Costa Avenue. Left-turns would not be allowed to enter or exit the site as there would not be a median break on La Costa Avenue.

In addition, as proposed by Tentative Map 05-157, a 180-foot long eastbound deceleration lane would be constructed adjacent to the project site and west of the proposed access from La Costa Avenue to account for the eastbound 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speeds of 69.1 MPH. Also, a stop sign at the project exit would be installed. The proposed project is consistent with its residential land use designation and would not introduce incompatible uses to the project vicinity. There is no impact.

***Issue 7: Would the proposed project cause an effect upon, or a need for new or altered maintenance of roads?***

The project would not construct any new public roads requiring maintenance. All roadways proposed by the project would occur on-site, and would be maintained as private roadways.

***Issue 8: Would the proposed project cause an effect upon circulation during the project’s construction?***

Short-term construction traffic would not exceed the total number of daily trips (200 ADT) or the total number of peak hour trips (16 morning and 20 evening) projected for the proposed project at build-out. As described under “Issue 1,” this increase in traffic will not cause a significant impact. Thus, the grading of approximately 19,000 cubic yards of earth and construction of 19 single-family residential homes at the site would not significantly affect surrounding roadways during project construction.

***Issue 9:*** *Would the proposed project result in inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses?*

The proposed project would not prevent or limit emergency access to nearby uses. In addition, the project site and surrounding area are not identified as in any emergency planning documents. Therefore, a significant impact would not occur.

***Issue 10:*** *Would the proposed project conflict with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g. bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?*

The proposed project does not conflict with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation, as identified in the discussion of project consistency with Land Use in EIR Section 4.1.

***Issue 11:*** *Would the proposed project conflict with bike trails?*

According to the City of Encinitas Bikeway Master Plan, the only designated bike trails within the project vicinity occurs along La Costa Avenue, where an existing Class II bike lane is provided. There are no additional bike trails proposed within the project vicinity, and no bike trails are proposed by the project. Therefore, a significant impact would not occur.

## **6.2 SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS WHICH CANNOT BE AVOIDED IF THE PROPOSED PROJECT IS IMPLEMENTED**

As described in detail in Section 4.0 and Section 5.0 of this EIR, the proposed project is anticipated to result in significant adverse impact that cannot be mitigated to below a level of significance after implementation of relevant standard conditions of approval, regulations, and mitigation measures. In summary, and as required by CEQA Guideline Section 15126.2(b), the unavoidable significant impact that would result from implementation of the proposed project is:

**Land Use - (Other Policy Conflicts)**

As discussed in EIR Section 4.1, *Land Use*, project implementation would result in a policy conflict with the City of Encinitas Resource Management Policies 10.6 and 10.9 regarding the preservation and protection of wetlands within the City's planning area. Project implementation would result in significant and direct impacts to 0.17 acres of wetland habitats, specifically southern willow scrub. These impacts result from the need to construct a soft-bottomed culvert and crossing at the entrance into the project site from La Costa Avenue. Mitigation for impacts to wetlands are proposed in EIR Section 4.2, *Biological Resources*, which would require enhancement of existing southern willow scrub habitat at a 1.4:1 ratio and creation of southern willow scrub habitat at a 5.6:1 ratio.

## **6.3 SIGNIFICANT, IRREVERSIBLE ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGES WHICH WOULD BE INVOLVED IN THE PROPOSED ACTION SHOULD IT BE IMPLEMENTED**

CEQA Guidelines mandate that the EIR must address any significant irreversible environmental changes which would be involved if the proposed action should be implemented [CEQA Guidelines, Section 15126.2(c)]. An impact would fall into this category if:

- 1. The project would involve a large commitment of nonrenewable resources.*
- 2. The primary and secondary impacts of the project would generally commit future generations to similar uses.*

3. *The project involves uses in which irreversible damage could result from any potential environmental incidents associated with the project.*
4. *The proposed consumption of resources is not justified (e.g., the project results in wasteful use of energy).*

Determining whether the proposed project may result in significant irreversible effects requires a determination of whether key resources would be degraded or destroyed in such a way that there would be little possibility of restoring them. Natural resources in the form of construction materials and energy resources would be used in the construction of the project, but is not expected to negatively impact the availability of these resources. Structures that would be built would meet or exceed the energy conservation measures outlined in the Uniform Building Code (UBC).

Air quality in the local area would be affected by the proposed project. Implementation of the proposed project would result in an increase of CO, NO<sub>x</sub>, and PM<sub>10</sub> emissions during construction. Long-term operational emissions from vehicular traffic would increase NO<sub>x</sub> and ROG emissions. However, impacts associated with these emissions are not significant due to the relatively small size of the project (19 dwelling units). Construction of the site as proposed by the project would commit the site to residential uses for the foreseeable future, thereby limiting the range of future uses on that portion of the project site.

Landforms within the 9.86-acre portion of the project site proposed for development would be altered by grading. The character of the 9.86 acres of the project site would be changed from vacant and undeveloped to urban development.

## 6.4 GROWTH INDUCEMENT

CEQA requires a discussion of the ways in which the proposed project could be growth inducing. The CEQA Guidelines identify a project as growth inducing if it would foster economic or population growth or the construction of additional housing either directly or indirectly in the surrounding environment (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(d)]. New employees from nearby commercial development, schools, golf courses, and new population from residential development represent direct forms of growth. These direct forms of growth have a secondary effect of expanding the size of local markets and inducing additional economic activity in the area.

Under CEQA, growth inducement is not considered necessarily detrimental, beneficial or of little significance to the environment. Typically, growth-inducing potential of a project would be considered significant if it fosters growth or a concentration of population in excess of what is assumed in pertinent master plans, land use plans or in projections made by regional planning agencies such as the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG). Significant growth impacts also could occur if the project provides infrastructure or service capacity to accommodate growth beyond the levels currently permitted by local or regional plans and policies. In general, growth induced by a project is considered a significant impact if it directly or indirectly affects the ability of agencies to provide needed public services or if it can be demonstrated that the potential growth significantly affects the environment in some other way.

Indirect growth inducing impacts at the local level result from a demand for additional goods and services associated with the increase in project population. This occurs in suburban or rural environments where population growth results in increased demand for service and commodity markets responding to the new population. This type of growth is, however, a regional phenomenon

resulting from introduction of a major employment center or regionally significant housing project. Due to the small number of dwelling units proposed by the project (19 dwelling units), implementation of the proposed project would not result in indirect growth-inducing impacts on the region.

The project proposes to develop a maximum of 19 dwelling units and roads and retain open space on approximately 47.81 acres, and would result in an increase in the City's population by approximately 48 persons. The San Diego Association of Government's (SANDAG) most recently adopted (April 2004) growth forecasts are reflected below in Table 6-4, *Regional Growth Forecast*. The proposed project is consistent with those forecasts. Furthermore, the proposed project is consistent with the land use intensity envisioned by the City of Encinitas General Plan, which designates the site Rural Residential 1 (RR-1).

**Table 6-4 REGIONAL GROWTH FORECAST**

CATEGORY	2000	2010	2020	2030
Population	2,813,833	3,211,721	3,528,605	3,855,085
Households	1,040,149	1,166,094	1,254,647	1,354,088

Source: SANDAG, 2030 Regional Growth Forecast (November 21, 2003) ; <http://www.sandag.org/>