

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Program Environmental Impact Report (Program EIR) has been prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) for the City of San Diego's Draft General Plan (Draft General Plan). It analyzes the potential significant impacts of the adoption and implementation of the Draft General Plan by the City of San Diego. This document was prepared under the direction of the City's Environmental Review Manager, and it reflects the independent judgment of the City of San Diego as Lead Agency under CEQA.

1.1 PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF THE PROGRAM EIR

This Program EIR is intended to provide information to public agencies, the general public and decision makers regarding potential environmental impacts related to adoption and implementation of the Draft General Plan by the City of San Diego. The purpose of an EIR, under the provisions of CEQA, is "to identify the significant effects on the environment of a project, to identify alternatives to the project, and to indicate the manner in which those significant effects can be mitigated or avoided." (Public Resources Code **Section 21002.1(a)**)

The major purposes of this Program EIR are to:

- Identify current and projected environmental conditions which may affect or be affected by the Draft General Plan;
- Disclose the Draft General Plan's potential environmental impacts to the public and decision makers;
- Inform the public and foster public participation in the City's planning process;
- Identify goals, policies and recommendations and, to the extent feasible, mitigation measures which could eliminate or reduce potentially significant environmental impacts; and,
- Evaluate alternatives that might be environmentally superior to the Draft General Plan.

Section 15168 of the CEQA Guidelines defines a Program EIR as "an EIR which may be prepared on a series of actions that can be characterized as one large project and are related either: (1) geographically; (2) a[s] logical parts in the chain of contemplated actions; (3) in connection with the issuance of rules, regulations, plans, or other general criteria to govern the conduct of a continuing program; or (4) as individual activities carried out under the same authorizing statutory or regulatory authority and having generally similar environmental impacts which can be mitigated in similar ways." The Draft General Plan Program EIR was prepared to be consistent with the requirements established under **Section 15168** of the CEQA Guidelines.

Issues areas addressed in the Program EIR include:

- | | |
|--------------------------|--|
| ■ Agricultural Resources | ■ Noise |
| ■ Air Quality | ■ Paleontological Resources |
| ■ Biological Resources | ■ Population and Housing |
| ■ Geologic Conditions | ■ Public Services and Facilities |
| ■ Health and Safety | ■ Public Utilities |
| ■ Historic Resources | ■ Transportation/Traffic Circulation/Parking |
| ■ Hydrology | ■ Visual Effects and Neighborhood Character |
| ■ Land Use | ■ Water Quality |
| ■ Mineral Resources | |

The Program EIR also includes other required CEQA analyses including growth inducement, cumulative impacts, significant irreversible environmental changes, unavoidable significant environmental changes, areas of no significant environmental impact, and alternatives.

1.2 PROJECT SUMMARY

The City of San Diego's Draft General Plan is the proposed Project addressed in this Program Environmental Impact Report (Program EIR). California Government Code mandates that all cities prepare a general plan that establishes policies and standards for future development, housing affordability, and resource protection. State law also encourages cities to keep general plans current through regular updates.

The City's updated Draft General Plan sets out a long range, comprehensive framework for how the City could grow and develop, provide public services, and maintain the qualities that define San Diego for the next 20-plus years. The Draft General Plan has been guided by the City of Villages growth strategy and citywide policy direction contained within the Strategic Framework Element (adopted by the City Council on October 22, 2002). The updated General Plan would replace the Strategic Framework Element (2002) and the *Progress Guide and General Plan* (1979).

Because less than four percent of the City's land remains vacant and available for new development, the Plan's policies represent a shift in focus from how to develop vacant land to how to reinvest in existing communities. Therefore, the City has drafted new policies and programs to support changes in development patterns to emphasize combining housing, shopping, employment uses, schools, and civic uses, at different scales, in village centers. By directing growth primarily toward village centers, the strategy in the updated Draft General Plan works to preserve established residential neighborhoods and manage the City's growth over the long term. The City has developed this Plan within the context of state planning requirements, regional plans and population projections, and the issues and needs unique to the City of San Diego. As a result, the Draft General Plan establishes guiding principals and primary objectives to achieve:

1. An open space network formed by parks, canyons, river valleys, habitats, beaches, and ocean;
2. Diverse residential communities formed by the open space network;
3. Compact and walkable mixed-use villages of different scales within communities;
4. Employment centers for a strong economy;
5. An integrated regional transportation network of transit, roadways, and freeways that efficiently links communities and villages to each other and to employment centers;
6. High quality and well-maintained public facilities to serve the City's population, workers, and visitors;
7. Historic districts and sites that respect our heritage;
8. Balanced communities that offer opportunities for all San Diegans and share citywide responsibilities;
9. A clean and sustainable environment; and,
10. A high aesthetic standard.

The City's Draft General Plan achieves these principles and objectives through new policy direction in the following nine elements, combined with the previously adopted Housing Element: Land Use and Community Planning; Mobility; Urban Design; Economic Prosperity; Public Facilities, Services and Safety; Recreation; Conservation; Noise; and Historic Preservation. The update to the Housing Element was adopted under separate cover by the City Council on December 5, 2006.

The Draft General Plan requires San Diego City Council approval and certification of the Program EIR through a noticed public hearing (a Process 5 decision). Prior to the City Council hearing, a noticed Planning Commission hearing will be held. The Planning Commission will forward a written recommendation to the City Council for adoption of the General Plan and certification of the Program EIR.

Because the General Plan is a policy-level document, future actions will be required for its implementation. These future actions include, but are not limited to: community plan updates, land development code amendments, development of a park master plan, an update to the City's Economic Development Strategy, development projects, Capital Improvement Program projects, and others. Although it is expected that environmental review of these future actions may tier from this EIR, separate environmental analysis pursuant to CEQA will be performed for these actions. Approval of the General Plan and certification of this EIR will not authorize any physical development.

1.3 SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Sections 3.1 through 3.17 of the Program EIR present the impact analysis for the Draft General Plan. **Table 1.0-1**, located at the end of this section, provides a summary of environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Draft General Plan. **Table 1.0-1** also includes goals, policies, and recommendations and where feasible, mitigation measures to reduce and/or avoid the environmental effects, with a conclusion as to whether the impact may be mitigated to below a level of significance.

The Program EIR determined that the Draft General Plan could result in significant project-level and cumulative impacts to each environmental issue area analyzed within the EIR, including: agricultural resources, air quality, biological resources, geologic conditions, health and safety, historic resources, hydrology, land use, mineral resources, noise, paleontological resources, population and housing, public services and facilities, public utilities, transportation/traffic/circulation/parking, visual effects and neighborhood character, and water quality. The Program EIR provides a program-level mitigation framework to reduce these impacts. However, since no specific development projects have been proposed by the Draft General Plan, it is not possible to propose feasible mitigation measures to ensure that all future project-level impacts would be reduced to a level less than significant. As such, each of the issue areas identified above describes impacts that may remain significant and unavoidable even with the proposed program-level mitigation framework.

In response to comments made on the Draft General Plan during the public review period, the City has strengthened (amplified) the policies of the Draft General Plan to reduce greenhouse gas emissions of future development and City operations under the General Plan and meet the

obligations of CEQA to mitigate the cumulatively significant global warming impacts of the General Plan. In addition, the City has incorporated the principal objectives of the environmentally superior Enhanced Sustainability Alternative and the principal objective of the Increased Parking Management Alternative into the Draft General Plan.

1.4 POTENTIAL AREAS OF CONTROVERSY

Pursuant to § 15123(b) (2) of the state CEQA Guidelines, an EIR shall identify areas of controversy known to the lead agency including issues raised by agencies and the public. The Notice of Preparation for the Program EIR was distributed on September 8, 2006 for a 30-day public review and comment period. Public comments were received and reflect concern and/or controversy over several project-level and cumulative environmental issues. (Refer to Appendix A for the NOP and NOP comment letters.) In addition, two public scoping meetings were held, one on September 13, 2006, and the other on September 25, 2006. Major environmental issues and potential areas of controversy raised in the NOP comment letters as well as public scoping meetings are as follows:

- Air Quality
- Alternatives
- Biological Resources
- Growth Management and Growth Inducing Impacts
- Population and Housing
- Land Use
- Provision of Public Services and Facilities
- Public Utilities
- Strategic Framework Element EIR
- Traffic and Circulation
- Water Quality

1.5 SUMMARY OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

In addition to five alternatives initially considered but determined to be infeasible, Chapter 7.0 of this Program EIR analyzes four alternatives to the Draft General Plan as follows:

- No Project
- Enhanced Sustainability
- Increased Parking Management
- Concentrated Growth

No Project

This alternative is analyzed within this Program EIR as it is required under CEQA Guidelines §15126.6(e). For the purposes of this Program EIR, the No Project Alternative represents buildout under the currently adopted plans as further described below. This alternative does not represent a “no build” scenario in which no future development would occur. Under the No Project Alternative, the Draft General Plan would not be implemented and projected future

growth would occur in accordance with the 1979 Progress Guide and General Plan (existing General Plan), the Strategic Framework Element, which was adopted by the City Council in October 2002, and the City's Housing Element, which was adopted in December 2006.

The existing General Plan is out-of-date, and largely irrelevant for directing the type of future growth and development anticipated to occur in the years to come. It primarily addressed development of vacant land and ensuring that new communities were built with adequate public facilities. It does not have a distinct Land Use Element, but relies exclusively on community plans to provide land use designations and policies. The existing General Plan does not establish an effective citywide framework for how to remedy facilities deficits, prioritize capital improvements, or to preserve or create a high quality of life as the City matures.

The No Project Alternative would generally meet all of the project objectives. Impacts associated with agricultural resources, biological resources, geologic conditions, health and safety, historic resources, hydrology, mineral resources, noise, paleontological resources, population and housing, public services and facilities, public utilities, visual effects and neighborhood character, and water quality would be similar compared to the Draft General Plan. Air quality, land use and traffic impacts would be greater when compared to the Draft General Plan.

Enhanced Sustainability

This alternative is analyzed as a means of further reducing the environmental effects of the Draft General Plan related to energy and water consumption, solid waste generation, water quality and air quality. Specifically, this alternative would add mandatory policies to the Draft General Plan to enhance the sustainability of future development within the plan area.

The Enhanced Sustainability alternative would meet all of the project objectives. Impacts associated with agricultural resources, biological resources, geologic conditions, health and safety, historic resources, land use, mineral resources, noise, paleontological resources, population and housing, public services and facilities, traffic, and visual effects and neighborhood character would be similar compared to the Draft General Plan. Air quality, hydrology, public utilities, and water quality impacts would be less under this alternative. This is the environmentally superior alternative to the Draft General Plan.

Increased Parking Management

This alternative expands the currently available parking management tools by expanding implementation of Community Parking Districts and permit parking districts throughout the City. This alternative would also increase parking meter fees and extend the hours when parking meter payment is required. The Community Parking District program allows for direct investment and benefit of the parking management revenue generated within its boundaries, thus providing a source of revenue for community infrastructure and amenities. Permit parking districts address transient and spillover parking problems by restricting on-street parking to permit holders within a specified area. This alternative would substantially reduce free on-street parking in the City, increase parking meter fees and hours of enforcement thereby increasing the cost of parking. This would serve to reduce and or eliminate a number of automobile trips, reduce parking

demand, and increase the number of multimodal trips such as carpooling, transit, walking and biking. This alternative is analyzed as a means of further reducing the environmental effects of the Draft General Plan relating to air quality and traffic.

The Increased Parking Management Alternative would meet all of the project objectives. Impacts associated with agricultural resources, biological resources, geologic conditions, health and safety, historic resources, hydrology, land use, mineral resources, noise, paleontological resources, population and housing, public services and facilities, public utilities, visual effects and neighborhood character, and water quality would be similar compared to the Draft General Plan. Air quality and traffic impacts would be less.

Concentrated Growth

This alternative is analyzed within this Program EIR as a means to focus projected growth into four subareas of the City that are served by high quality transit. Environmental impacts would be greater in these four subareas, but would likely decrease in other areas of the City. Under this alternative, infill and redevelopment would be focused in the Downtown San Diego and Uptown communities; and in Urban Village Centers within the Mission Valley/Morena/Grantville, University/Sorrento Mesa, and Midway-Pacific Highway subareas to a greater extent than is envisioned under the Draft General Plan. In addition, under this alternative, higher density infill and redevelopment would be discouraged in Neighborhood/Community Villages and within Transit Corridors outside of the above-referenced subareas. Due to the high cost of land and the scarcity of vacant developable land in the four subareas, it would be more difficult to secure the population-based park lands needed to provide public facilities in accordance with General Plan, as compared to the Draft General Plan.

Note: The “Summary Table of Significant Impacts and Mitigation Framework to Reduce the Effects” located on pages 1.0-7 – 1.0-15 provides an overview of the Mitigation Framework. The Mitigation, Monitoring and Reporting Program containing a list of the General Plan policies which provide mitigation at the program level for each environmental issue area can be found in Section 9.

**Table 1.0-1
Summary Table of Significant Impacts and Mitigation Framework to Reduce the Effects**

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Framework
<i>Agricultural Resources (See Section 3.1)</i>	
<p>Implementation of the Draft General Plan could yield significant impacts to agricultural resources. Mitigation for impacts is not available at the Program EIR level since specific development projects are not known. Therefore, the impact to agricultural resources is significant and unavoidable.</p>	<p>Mitigation for impacts to agricultural resources would occur at the project level and may involve preservation of important agricultural lands or buffers between new uses and existing adjacent agricultural uses.</p>
<i>Air Quality (See Section 3.2)</i>	
<p>Implementation of the Draft General Plan could yield significant impacts to Air Quality. Specifically, particulate matter from construction and concentrated carbon monoxide (CO) “hot spots” would be significant and unavoidable at the program level. Greenhouse gas emissions would also be significant and unavoidable.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For projects that may exceed daily construction emissions established by the City of San Diego, Best Available Control Measures (BACMs) would be incorporated to reduce construction emissions to below daily emission standards established by the City. • Development that could significantly impact air quality, either individually or cumulatively, would receive entitlement only if conditioned with all reasonable mitigation to avoid, minimize, or offset the impact. As a part of this process, future projects may be required to buffer sensitive receptors from air pollution sources through the use of landscaping, open space, and other separation techniques.

**Table 1.0-1
Summary Table of Significant Impacts and Mitigation Framework to Reduce the Effects**

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Framework
<i>Biological Resources (See Section 3.3)</i>	
<p>Implementation of the Draft General Plan could yield significant impacts to biological resources. Mitigation for impacts is not available at the Program EIR level since specific development projects are not known. Therefore, the impact to biological resources remains significant and unavoidable.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development projects must be designed to minimize impacts to natural habitats consistent with City plans and ordinances. • Biological mitigation for upland impacts must be in accordance with the City’s Biology Guidelines, Table 3.3.4. • Development projects must provide for continued wildlife movement through wildlife corridors as identified in the MSCP Subarea Plan or as identified through project-level analysis. Mitigation may include, but is not limited to, provision of appropriately-sized bridges, culverts, or other openings to allow wildlife movement. • For all projects adjacent to the MHPA, the development must conform to all applicable MHPA Land Use Adjacency Guidelines (Section 1.4.3) of the MSCP Subarea Plan. • Schedule the construction of projects to avoid impacts to wildlife (e.g., avoid the breeding season for sensitive species) to the extent practicable. • Implement appropriate noise attenuation measures as it affects sensitive avian species, post construction, to reduce noise levels at the edge of occupied habitat. • Protection of wetlands and vernal pools. • Limit the disturbance to native vegetation to the extent practicable.
<i>Geologic Conditions (See Section 3.4)</i>	
<p>Implementation of the Draft General Plan could yield significant impacts to geologic conditions. Since the Draft General Plan does not include specific development projects, it is infeasible at the Program EIR level to provide specific mitigation that would reduce any future impacts to a less than significant level. Therefore, at this program level of review, impacts a significant and unavoidable impact associated with seismic and geologic hazards, erosion, and unstable geology and soils remains.</p>	<p>General measures that may be implemented to preclude impacts include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preparation of soil and geologic conditions surveys. • Implementation of state seismic and structural design requirements. • Grading techniques that reduce landslide and erosion hazard impacts.

**Table 1.0-1
Summary Table of Significant Impacts and Mitigation Framework to Reduce the Effects**

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Framework
<i>Health and Safety (See Section 3.5)</i>	
<p>Implementation of the Draft General Plan could yield significant impacts to health and safety. The potential for exposure of sensitive receptors to health hazards and wildfires will remain significant and unavoidable at the program level. The Airport Environs Overlay Zone (AEOZ) covers less area than the boundaries of the airport influence area, which could allow the development of future projects that could pose a potentially significant impact outside of the AEOZ boundaries, but within the airport influence area.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Future projects locating non-residential employment uses in proximity to residential development or vice versa must be sited and designed in a manner that reduces or avoids potential health and safety incompatibility impacts. Prior to the approval of any entitlement, the City would evaluate the project in light of the Conversion/Collocation Suitability Factors (located in Appendix C of the Draft General Plan) would be used to analyze compatibility of site specific proposals. • Future projects located in known High Fire Hazard Areas must be sited and designed to minimize impacts to fire. Prior to approval of any entitlement for a future project, the City would ensure that any impacts from wildfire or landslides will be reduced and, if necessary, mitigated in accordance with the requirements of the City of San Diego. • Future discretionary projects located in an airport influence area will be submitted to the ALUC for consistency determinations with the adopted ALUCPs up until the time when the ALUC adopts the updated ALUCPs. After the ALUC adoption of the updated ALUCPs, the City will submit future projects located in an airport influence area until the ALUC determines that the City’s affected land use plans, development regulations, and zoning ordinances are consistent with the ALUCPs. Amendments to land use plans, development regulations, and zoning ordinances that are within an airport influence area must be submitted the ALUC prior to adoption.
<i>Historical Resources (See Section 3.6)</i>	
<p>Implementation of the Draft General Plan could yield significant impacts to historical resources. Although significant impacts to historical resources may be mitigated through review of discretionary projects, specific mitigation at the Program EIR level is not available since specific development projects are not known. Therefore, the impact to historical resources is significant and unavoidable.</p>	<p>Specific mitigation at the Program EIR level is not available. However, measures incorporated into future projects can reduce potential impacts to historical resources. Steps are taken to identify and mitigate significant impacts to historical resources, as part of the discretionary review of development projects.</p>
<i>Hydrology (See Section 3.7)</i>	

**Table 1.0-1
Summary Table of Significant Impacts and Mitigation Framework to Reduce the Effects**

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Framework
<p>Implementation of the Draft General Plan could yield significant impacts to hydrology. At this time, no specific projects have been proposed, and therefore it is not possible to propose feasible mitigation measures to reduce project-level impacts, It is infeasible in this program level EIR to provide specific mitigation that would reduce any further impacts to a less than significant level. As such, significant unavoidable impacts related to absorption rates, drainage patterns, or rates of surface runoff remain.</p>	<p>Future projects must be sited and designed to minimize impacts to absorption rates, drainage patterns, and rates of surface runoff in accordance with City requirements and other appropriate agencies including the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board. Such siting and design may include implementation of the mitigation framework measures identified in Section 3.17.4 (see Water Quality section).</p> <p>The generalized Hydrology and Water Quality mitigation measures provided in the EIR may be updated, expanded and refined when applied to specific future projects based on project-specific design and changes in existing conditions, and local, state and federal laws.</p>
<p><i>Land Use (See Section 3.8)</i></p>	
<p>Implementation of the Draft General Plan could yield significant impacts to land use. Because the degree of future impacts and applicability, feasibility, and success of future mitigation measures cannot be adequately known for each specific future project at this program level of analysis, the program-level secondary environmental impacts related to conflicts with goals in adopted plans; incompatible land uses; and that may physically divide established communities remains significant and unavoidable.</p>	<p>A Community Plan update program is being established to help ensure that the City’s community plans are consistent with the General Plan, and that they serve as an effective means to implement citywide environmental policies and address policies related to Airport Land Use Plans.</p> <p>Existing and future regulations will also provide development standards aimed at reducing land use incompatibilities.</p> <p>Future projects must be reviewed to ensure that they do not conflict with the General Plan and applicable community plans resulting in a physical impact on the environment. Prior to the approval of any entitlement, the City would evaluate whether proposed projects implement specified land use, density/intensity, design guidelines, Airport Land Use Compatibility Plans, and other General Plan and community plan policies including open space preservation, community identity, mobility, and the timing, phasing, and provision of public facilities.</p>
<p><i>Mineral Resources (See Section 3.9)</i></p>	
<p>Implementation of the Draft General Plan could yield significant impacts to mineral resources. It is infeasible at this Program EIR level to provide more specific mitigation that would reduce impacts to a less than significant level, since specific development projects are not known. Thus, there is a potential</p>	<p>No Mitigation Measures are available at the Program EIR level of review that could reduce significant impacts to important mineral resources.</p>

**Table 1.0-1
Summary Table of Significant Impacts and Mitigation Framework to Reduce the Effects**

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Framework
for significant unavoidable impacts related to mineral resources.	

Noise (See Section 3.10)

<p>Implementation of the Draft General Plan could yield significant noise impacts. It is infeasible at this Program EIR level to provide more specific mitigation that would reduce impacts to a less than significant level, since specific development projects are not known. Thus, there is a potential for significant unavoidable impacts related to noise impacts.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Future development projects in areas where the existing or future noise level exceeds or would exceed the compatible noise level thresholds as indicated in the Land Use Compatibility for Community Noise Environment Table (Table 3.10-7) must perform an acoustical study consistent with Acoustical Study Guidelines (Table NE-4 in the Draft General Plan), so that appropriate noise mitigation measures are included in the project design to meet the noise guidelines. • Future projects must be sited and designed in a manner that avoids noise impacts to noise-sensitive land uses (e.g., residences, hospitals, schools, and libraries) and sensitive receptors. Prior to approval of any entitlement for a future project, the City will identify any noise impacts and measures to reduce and avoid such impacts in accordance with the City's Noise Ordinance and state regulations. This may require preparation of a noise analysis. • Where uses, particularly habitable structures, are planned near noise-generating sources, future projects must use a combination of architectural treatments or alternative methods to bring interior noise levels to below 45 dBA. or 50 dBA for specified uses as indicated in Table 3.10-7 • Future development projects that are located in an Airport Influence Area must use appropriate noise attenuation methods recommended in the appropriate Airport Land Use Compatibility Plans in order to meet acceptable interior noise levels for the use and aviation easements where required.
---	--

**Table 1.0-1
Summary Table of Significant Impacts and Mitigation Framework to Reduce the Effects**

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Framework
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All non-emergency construction activity for future projects must comply with the limits (maximum noise levels, hours and days of activity) established in state and City noise regulations.

Paleontological Resources (See Section 3.11)

**Table 1.0-1
Summary Table of Significant Impacts and Mitigation Framework to Reduce the Effects**

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Framework
<p>Implementation of the Draft General Plan could yield significant impacts to paleontological resources. Although significant impacts to paleontological resources can be mitigated through review and monitoring of discretionary development projects, mitigation for the proposed project is not available. Additionally, impacts at the project level for non-discretionary projects would not be mitigated due to a lack of regulatory language in the land development code requiring protection of paleontological resources. It is infeasible at this Program EIR level to provide more specific mitigation that would reduce impacts to a less than significant level, since specific development projects are not known. Thus, the impact to paleontological resources is considered significant and unavoidable.</p>	<p>At this time, mitigation is accomplished through monitoring, recovery, and curation of fossils. Steps are taken to identify and mitigate significant impacts to paleontological resources as part of the discretionary review of development projects.</p>
<p><i>Population and Housing (See Section 3.12)</i></p>	
<p>Implementation of the Draft General Plan could yield significant impacts to population and housing. Since no specific development projects have been identified, it is infeasible at this Program EIR level to provide specific mitigation that would reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Therefore, displacement of substantial numbers residents necessitating the construction of replacement housing is considered a significant and unavoidable impact at this program level of review.</p>	<p>Specific mitigation at the Program EIR level is not available. However, measures incorporated into future projects may reduce any potential impacts.</p>
<p><i>Public Facilities (See Section 3.13)</i></p>	

**Table 1.0-1
Summary Table of Significant Impacts and Mitigation Framework to Reduce the Effects**

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Framework
<p>Implementation of the Draft General Plan could yield significant impacts related to the construction of new or altered public facilities. No specific projects or actions have been identified with the Draft General Plan that would result in any direct or indirect physical change in the environment. However, future growth is anticipated and the construction of future public facilities needed to support that growth may result in environmental impacts. Therefore, impacts associated with the construction of public facilities may occur and those impacts remain significant and unavoidable.</p>	<p>The need for new or upgraded facilities is addressed through the various means the City uses to fund the capital and operating expenses related to public facilities (e.g., developer fees and City Council budget decisions). However, the analysis of public services and facilities in this document focuses on the physical environmental impacts that could result from the construction of new facilities or the alteration of existing facilities. It is anticipated that many of these activities would result in physical impacts. Therefore, the framework for the mitigation of public services and facilities projects will vary, depending on the type of physical impacts resulting from each project. For instance, if the construction of a new park would impact biological and historical resources, the project’s mitigation measures would be developed using the mitigation framework in the Biological and Historical Resources sections contained in this document. In other words, the Public Facilities and Services mitigation framework is contained in the relevant impact issue area chapters of this document.</p>
<p><i>Public Utilities (See Section 3.14)</i></p>	
<p>Implementation of the Draft General Plan could yield significant impacts related to the construction of public utilities. No specific projects or actions have been identified with the Draft General Plan that would result in any direct or indirect physical change in the environment. However, future growth is anticipated and the construction of future public utilities needed to support that growth may result in environmental impacts. Therefore, impacts associated with the construction of public utilities may occur and those impacts remain significant and unavoidable.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Innovative project design, construction and operations to reduce storm water pollution, and energy use, and waste generation. The City’s Sustainable Building Policy (900-14) allows an expedited review time for the private sector who presents building projects meeting LEED silver criteria. • Implementation of water and energy conservation measures beyond what is required by local, state, and federal regulations. • Project siting, mix of land uses, and design that reduces the need to drive, thus reducing vehicle miles traveled compared to what would occur through conventional development. • Strategic planting of trees in quantities and locations that maximizes environmental benefits such as shading.
<p><i>Traffic (See Section 3.15)</i></p>	

**Table 1.0-1
Summary Table of Significant Impacts and Mitigation Framework to Reduce the Effects**

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Framework
<p>Implementation of the Draft General Plan could yield significant impacts to traffic. At this time, no specific projects have been proposed, and therefore it is not possible to propose feasible mitigation measures to reduce project-level impacts. It is infeasible in this program level EIR to provide specific mitigation that would reduce impacts to a less than significant level. As such, significant unavoidable impacts related to transportation/traffic/circulation/parking remain.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Walkable Communities – (see Draft General Plan policies ME-A.1 thru ME-A.10 for the policy foundation) • Street and Freeway System – (see Draft General Plan policies ME-C.1 thru ME-C.10) • Transportation Demand Management (TDM) – (see Draft General Plan policies ME-E.1 thru ME-E.8) • Bicycling – (see Draft General Plan policies ME-F.1 thru ME-F.6) • Parking Management – (see Draft General Plan policies ME-G.1 thru ME-G.4)
<p><i>Visual Effects-Neighborhood Character (See Section 3.16)</i></p>	
<p>Implementation of the Draft General Plan could yield significant impacts to visual effects-neighborhood character.</p>	<p>No feasible specific mitigation has been identified at this program level. Future discretionary actions and proposals will be analyzed pursuant to CEQA and project level mitigation required.</p>
<p><i>Water Quality (See Section 3.17)</i></p>	
<p>Implementation of the Draft General Plan could yield significant impacts to water quality. Because the degree of future impacts and applicability, feasibility, and success of future mitigation measures cannot be adequately known for each specific future project at this program level of analysis, the program-level impact related to water quality remains significant and unavoidable.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increasing on-site filtration. • Preserving, restoring or incorporating natural drainage systems into site design. • Directing concentrated flows away from MHPA and open space areas. If not possible, drainage must be directed into sedimentation basins, grassy swales or mechanical trapping devices prior to draining into the MHPA or open space areas. • Reducing the amount of impervious surfaces through selection of materials, site planning, and the narrowing of street widths, where possible. • Increasing the use of vegetation in drainage design. • Maintaining landscape design standards that minimize the use of pesticides and herbicides. • To the extent feasible, avoiding development of areas particularly susceptible to erosion and sediment loss.

The level of significance after mitigation measures for each of the sections within the table remains significant and unavoidable.