

**DRAFT PROGRAM ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (PEIR) CANDIDATE FINDINGS
FOR THE UPTOWN COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE
REGARDING FINAL PEIR FOR THE UPTOWN COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE
PROJECT NUMBER 380611
SCH No. 2016061023**

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations

The following Candidate Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations are made for the Uptown Community Plan Update (CPU) (hereinafter referred to as the "Project"). The environmental effects of the Project are addressed in the Final Program Environmental Impact Report ("Final PEIR") dated September 2016 (State Clearinghouse No.2016061023), which is incorporated by reference herein.

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code §§ 21000, *et seq.*) and the State CEQA Guidelines (Guidelines) (14 California Code of Regulations §§ 15000, *et seq.*) promulgated thereunder, require that the environmental impacts of a proposed project be examined before a project is approved. In addition, once significant impacts have been identified, CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines require that certain findings be made before project approval. It is the exclusive discretion of the decision maker certifying the EIR to determine the adequacy of the proposed candidate findings. Specifically, regarding findings, Guidelines Section 15091 provides:

- (a) No public agency shall approve or carry out a project for which an EIR has been certified which identifies one or more significant environmental effects of the project unless the public agency makes one or more written findings for each of those significant effects, accompanied by a brief explanation of the rationale for each finding. The possible findings are:
1. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.
 2. Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
 3. Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.
- (b) The findings required by subdivision (a) shall be supported by substantial evidence in the record.
- (c) The finding in subdivision (a)(2) shall not be made if the agency making the finding has concurrent jurisdiction with another agency to deal with identified feasible mitigation

measures or alternatives. The finding in subdivision (a)(3) shall describe the specific reasons for rejecting identified mitigation measures and project alternatives.

- (d) When making the findings required in subdivision (a)(1), the agency shall also adopt a program for reporting on or monitoring the changes which it has either required in the project or made a condition of approval to avoid or substantially lessen significant environmental effects. These measures must be fully enforceable through permit conditions, agreements, or other measures.
- (e) The public agency shall specify the location and custodian of the documents or other materials which constitute the record of the proceedings upon which its decision is based.
- (f) A statement made pursuant to Section 15093 does not substitute for the findings required by this section.

These requirements also exist in Section 21081 of the CEQA statute. The “changes or alterations” referred to in Section 15091(a)(1) above, that are required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects of the project, may include a wide variety of measures or actions as set forth in Guidelines Section 15370, including:

- (a) Avoiding the impact altogether by not taking a certain action or parts of an action.
- (b) Minimizing impacts by limiting the degree or magnitude of the action and its implementation.
- (c) Rectifying the impact by repairing, rehabilitating, or restoring the impacted environment.
- (d) Reducing or eliminating the impact over time by preservation and maintenance operations during the life of the action.
- (e) Compensating for the impact by replacing or providing substitute resources or environments.

Should significant and unavoidable impacts remain after changes or alterations are applied to the project, a Statement of Overriding Considerations must be prepared. The statement provides the lead agency's views on whether the benefits of a project outweigh its unavoidable adverse environmental effects. Regarding a Statement of Overriding Considerations, Guidelines Section 15093 provides:

- (a) CEQA requires the decision-making agency to balance, as applicable, the economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits, including region- wide or statewide environmental benefits, of a proposed project against its unavoidable environmental risks when determining whether to approve the project. If the specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits, including region-wide or statewide environmental benefits, of a proposed project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, the adverse environmental effects may be considered “acceptable.”
- (b) When the lead agency approves a project which will result in the occurrence of significant effects which are identified in the final EIR but are not avoided or substantially lessened, the

agency shall state in writing the specific reasons to support its action based on the final EIR and/or other information in the record. The statement of overriding considerations shall be supported by substantial evidence in the record.

- (c) If an agency makes a statement of overriding considerations, the statement should be included in the record of the project approval and should be mentioned in the notice of determination. This statement does not substitute for, and shall be in addition to, findings required pursuant to Section 15091.

Having received, reviewed and considered the Final Program Environmental Impact Report for the Uptown Community Plan Update, State Clearinghouse No. 2016061023 (PEIR), as well as all other information in the record of proceedings on this matter, the following Findings of Fact (Findings) are made and Statement of Overriding Considerations (Statement) is adopted by the City of San Diego (City) in its capacity as the CEQA Lead Agency. These Findings and Statement set forth the environmental basis for current and subsequent discretionary actions to be undertaken by the City and responsible agencies for the implementation of the project.

The following Findings have been prepared by the Planning Department as candidate findings to be made by the decision-making body.

B. Record of Proceedings

For purposes of CEQA and these Findings, the Record of Proceedings for the Project consists of the following documents and other evidence, at a minimum:

- The Notice of Preparation (NOP), dated December 23, 2013, and all other public notices issued by the City in conjunction with the Project;
- The Draft PEIR (Draft PEIR), dated June 10, 2016;
- The Final PEIR for the Project, dated September 2016;
- All written comments submitted by agencies or members of the public during the public review comment period on the Draft PEIR;
- All responses to written comments submitted by agencies or members of the public during the public review comment period on the Draft PEIR and included in the Final PEIR;
- The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP);
- The reports and technical memoranda included or referenced in Responses to Comments and/or in the Final PEIR;
- All documents, studies, EIRs, or other materials incorporated by reference in the Draft PEIR and the Final PEIR;
- Matters of common knowledge to the City, including but not limited to federal, state and local laws and regulations;
- Any documents expressly cited in these Findings and SOC; and
- Any other relevant materials required to be included in the record of proceedings pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21167.6(e).

C. Custodian and Location of Records

The documents and other materials which constitute the administrative record for the City's actions related to the project are located at the City of San Diego, Planning Department, 1010 Second Avenue, 12th Floor, San Diego, CA 92101. The City Planning Department is the custodian of the administrative record for the Project. Copies of these documents, which constitute the record of proceedings, are and at all relevant times have been, and will be available upon request at the offices of the City Planning Department. This information is provided in compliance with Public Resources Code Section 21081.6(a)(2) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(e).

II. PROJECT SUMMARY**A. Project Location**

The Uptown CPU area consists of approximately 2,700 acres (approximately 4.2 square miles) and is located in the central portion of the City of San Diego in close proximity to Downtown San Diego. Uptown abuts the community planning areas of Old Town San Diego and Midway-Pacific Highway on the west, Mission Valley on the north, North Park on the east, and Downtown and Balboa Park on the south.

B. Project Background

The adopted Uptown Community Plan was last updated in 1988. The City initiated the process of updating the Uptown, North Park and Golden Hill Community Plans in 2009. The Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) was issued on December 23, 2013 (State Clearinghouse No. 2013121076) and a public scoping meeting was held on January 9, 2014, to gather agency and public input on the scope and content of the PEIR. As a result of timing related to stakeholder input, the environmental analysis for the Uptown CPU was analyzed in a separate CEQA document. While the North Park and Golden Hill CPUs are analyzed in one PEIR, these findings pertain only to the Uptown CPU.

Between 2009 and 2016, an extensive outreach program was undertaken to solicit input from residents, business owners, community leaders, public officials, and other interested parties. The outreach program included multiple Community Plan Update Advisory Committee (CPUAC) meetings on various land use topics, historic resources and mobility open house events, and a cluster workshop involving participants from each of the three communities to discuss urban design. Multi-day workshops or "charrettes" focusing on land use, areas of change and stability, urban design, mobility, historical resources, and recreation were conducted for the Uptown CPU area culminating in an urban design framework that would set the foundation for developing land use policies and recommendations. Additionally, "Open Mic Night" events were hosted by the City in an effort for community members to consider various perspectives from stakeholder organizations such as those representing local business districts, neighborhood-level organizations, historic preservation societies, planning and architectural organizations, and hospitals, as well as walkability, open space, and housing advocates. The policies and details of the CPU was developed and shaped through this process.

C. Project Description and Purpose

The project analyzed in the Final PEIR includes implementation of the Uptown CPU and associated discretionary actions described below. These Findings address the Uptown CPU and discretionary actions relevant to that community as described below. The purpose of the proposed Uptown CPU is to ensure consistency with and incorporate relevant policies from the City of San Diego General Plan (General Plan), as well as provide a long-range, comprehensive policy framework and vision for growth and development in the community through 2035.

The project includes amendments to the General Plan to incorporate the updated community plan as a component of the General Plan's Land Use Element; amendments to the Land Development Code and maps; adoption of the Uptown Impact Fee Study (IFS) (formerly known as the Public Facilities Financing Plan), and rezoning the CPU area with Citywide zones. The CPU and associated regulatory documents form the "project" for this Final PEIR.

Specific project elements are further detailed below:

1. Community Plan Elements

The Land Use Element defines Village Districts and key corridors where future growth is targeted in order to fulfill the General Plan's City of Villages strategy. While the proposed CPU sets forth procedures for implementation, it does not on its own establish regulations or legislation, nor does it, on its own, rezone property. Controls on development and use of public and private property including zoning, development regulations, and implementation of transportation improvements are included as part of the Uptown CPU.

The Uptown CPU contains nine elements and an Introduction and Implementation chapter. Applicable goals and policies are provided within each of the following elements: Land Use; Mobility; Urban Design; Economic Prosperity; Public Facilities, Services and Safety; Recreation; Conservation, Noise and Historic Preservation.

2. Zoning

Throughout the CPU area, Citywide zoning would be applied in all areas. Proposed densities would be consistent with existing zoning.

3. Land Development Code Amendments

- a. The project would repeal the Mid-City Communities Planned District and the West Lewis Street Planned District and rezone parcels with existing city-wide zones to implement the proposed land use plan designations.

The mapped boundaries of the existing Community Plan Implementation Overlay Zone (CPIOZ) would be amended within the Uptown community to replace CPIOZ-Type A, related to retail parking requirements for the Thackery Gallery structure in Hillcrest, and CPIOZ-Type B, related to discretionary review of office uses in the Medical Complex neighborhood with new boundaries to address ministerial review of building height limits within Hillcrest and Mission Hills (proposed CPIOZ-Type A) and discretionary

review of building height limits within Hillcrest and Bankers Hill/Park West (proposed CPIOZ-Type-B). The proposed CPIOZ-Type A identifies areas within the community where ministerial approval is granted for development that does not exceed 50 feet within Mission Hills and 65 feet in Hillcrest and Bankers Hill/Park West. The proposed CPIOZ-Type B identifies areas within the community where discretionary approval is granted through a Process 3 Site Development Permit for development that does not exceed 150 feet in Bankers Hill/Park West, 120 feet in central Hillcrest, and 100 feet in Hillcrest east of the SR-163. Maps depicting areas where the proposed CPIOZ-Type A and CPIOZ-Type B would be applied to address building heights are in the proposed Uptown CPU Urban Design Element.

4. MHPA Boundary Line Corrections

The project includes comprehensive community-wide Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA) boundary line corrections. The MHPA boundary line corrections were completed using a comprehensive, systematic approach. The boundary line corrections generally removed existing developed areas in addition to the 35-foot brush management zone 1 area as required in accordance with the City's Land Development Code, Section 142.0412. The comprehensive MHPA boundary corrections would result in removal of acreage of existing developed lands from the MHPA and an addition of sensitive habitats including coastal sage scrub and chaparral.

5. Adoption of the Uptown Impact Fee Study (IFS)

The project would include adoption of the Uptown IFS which provides a list of facilities that are needed to implement the goals of the community plan, and to develop applicable Development Impact Fees (DIFs) pursuant to the California Government Code through which new development will pay a share of the cost of those facilities based on a clear nexus. The IFS functions as an implementation document of the City of San Diego's General Plan and the Uptown CPU.

In summary, this project would update the existing Uptown Community Plan that was last updated by the City Council in 1988. The proposed Uptown CPU would be compatible with the adopted City of San Diego General Plan City of Villages strategy and would: provide guidance for future growth and redevelopment with regard to the distribution and arrangement of land uses (public and private), local street and transit network, prioritization and provision of public facilities, community and site-specific urban design guidelines, and recommendations to preserve and enhance natural and cultural resources.

The overall vision of the proposed Uptown CPU is to guide, over the next 20 to 30 years, future infill development that is transit supportive per the General Plan and is also protective of desired community character and resources. The proposed land use plan would locate the highest intensity land uses within the community along transit corridors where existing and future commercial, residential and mixed-use development can support existing and planned transit investments.

Following adoption of the Uptown CPU, changes may be required as a result of subsequent projects submittals in order to address changed circumstances and opportunities. If approved, they would take the form of amendments. The City's Planning Commission and City Council are responsible for

reviewing and evaluating recommendations, and/or approving any amendments. Any proposed amendment would be subject to environmental review.

D. Statement of Objectives

As described in Section 3.3 of the Final PEIR, the project has the following eight objectives:

1. Develop a multi-modal transportation network emphasizing active transportation measures for walkable and bicycle-friendly streets, and transit-related measures supporting transit operations and access.
2. Maintain or increase the housing supply through the designation of higher residential densities focusing along major transit corridors.
3. Provide for increased economic diversification through land use to increase employment and economic growth opportunities.
4. Preserve the neighborhood character and design relationships between neighborhoods within each community through the development of transitions and design policies.
5. Identify significant historical and cultural resources within each community and provide for their preservation, protection, and enhancement.
6. Provide increased recreation opportunities and new public open spaces.
7. Preserve, protect and enhance each community's natural landforms, including canyons and environmentally sensitive lands.
8. Include financing strategies that can secure infrastructure improvements concurrent with development.

III. SUMMARY OF IMPACTS

The project addressed in these findings is a comprehensive update to the existing Uptown Community Plan as described in Chapter 3.0 of the Final PEIR. The proposed CPU is a component of the City's General Plan as it expresses the General Plan policies in the proposed CPU area through the provision of more site-specific recommendations that implement goals and policies contained within the 10 elements of the General Plan. As such, the proposed CPU sets forth procedures for implementation and provides goals and policies for future development within the CPU area.

Controls on development and use of public and private property including zoning, design controls, and implementation of transportation improvements are included as part of the implementation program for the Uptown CPU.

The Final PEIR concludes that the proposed CPU would have **no significant impacts** and require no mitigation measures with respect to the following issues:

1. Land Use
 - Conflicts with Applicable Plans
 - Conversion of Open Space or Farmland
 - Conflicts with the MSCP Subarea Plan
 - Conflicts with an Adopted ALUCP
2. Visual Effects and Neighborhood Character
 - Scenic Vistas or Views
 - Neighborhood Character
 - Distinctive or Landmark Trees
 - Landform Alteration
 - Light or Glare
3. Transportation
 - Alternative Transportation
4. Air Quality
 - Conflicts with Air Quality Plans
 - Air Quality Standards
 - Sensitive Receptors
 - Odors
5. Greenhouse Gas Emissions
 - Greenhouse Gas Emissions
 - Conflicts with Plan or Policies
6. Noise
 - Airport Compatibility
 - Noise Ordinance Compliance
 - Temporary Construction Noise (Operational Vibration)
7. Biological Resources
 - Sensitive Wildlife Species
 - Sensitive Habitats
 - Wetlands
 - Wildlife Corridors and Nursery Sites
 - Multiple Species Conservation Program
8. Geologic Conditions
 - Seismic Hazards
 - Erosion or Loss of Topsoil

- Geologic Instability
 - Expansive Soils
9. Hydrology and Water Quality
- Flooding and Drainage Patterns
 - Water Quality
 - Groundwater
10. Public Services and Facilities
- New and altered public facilities
11. Public Utilities
- Water Supply
 - Utilities
 - Solid Waste and Recycling
12. Health and Safety
- Wildfire Hazards
 - Schools
 - Emergency Evacuation and response Plans
 - Hazardous Materials Site and Health Hazards
 - Aircraft Related Hazards

Potentially **significant impacts of the proposed Uptown CPU will be mitigated** to below a level of significance with respect to the following issues:

- Noise (Temporary Construction Noise)
- Paleontological Resources (for discretionary projects only)

No feasible mitigation measures are available to reduce impacts to below a level of significance for the following issues:

1. Transportation and Circulation
 - Traffic Circulation
2. Noise
 - Ambient Noise
 - Vehicular Noise
 - Temporary Construction Noise (vibration during construction)
3. Historical Resources
 - Historic Structures, Objects, or Sites
 - Prehistoric Resources, Sacred Sites, and Human Remains
4. Paleontological Resources (for ministerial projects only)

IV. FINDINGS REGARDING SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS

A. Findings Regarding Impacts That Will be Mitigated to Below a Level of Significance (CEQA §21081(a)(1) and CEQA Guidelines §15091(a)(1))

The City, having independently reviewed and considered the information contained in the Final PEIR and the public record for the project, finds, pursuant to Public Resource Code §21081(a)(1) and State CEQA Guidelines §15091(a)(1), that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which would mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment related to:

1. Noise – Temporary Construction Noise

Significant Effect

Construction activities related to implementation of the proposed CPU and associated discretionary actions would potentially generate short-term noise levels in excess of 75 dB(A) L_{eq} at adjacent properties (Impact 6.6-4).

Facts in Support of Finding

While the City regulates noise associated with construction equipment and activities through enforcement of noise ordinance standards (e.g., days of the week and hours of operation) and imposition of conditions of approval for building or grading permits, a permit may be obtained to deviate from the noise ordinance under certain circumstances. Due to the highly developed nature of the CPU area with sensitive receivers potentially located in proximity to construction sites, there is a potential for construction noise sensitive land uses to be exposed to noise levels in excess of noise ordinance standards. At a program-level of analysis, it is not possible to conduct site-specific noise evaluations to verify anticipated construction noise levels.

Rationale and Conclusion

Future development implemented in accordance with the CPU would be required to incorporate standard controls detailed in the Final PEIR mitigation measure NOISE-6.6-1 which would reduce construction noise levels emanating from the site, limit construction hours, and minimize disruption and annoyance. With the implementation of these measures, and the limited duration of the noise-generating construction period, the substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels from construction would be less than significant.

2. Paleontological Resources (Discretionary Projects only)

Significant Effect

A potentially significant impact would result from implementation of future discretionary projects within the Uptown CPU area associated with grading into the San Diego, Pomerado Conglomerate and Mission Valley Formations, which have a high sensitivity for paleontological resources. Grading into these formations could potentially destroy fossil resources (Impact 6.10-1).

Facts in Support of Finding

A potentially significant impact would occur because future development would have the potential to disturb geologic formations during grading that contain fossils. The Uptown CPU area is underlain with San Diego, Pomerado Conglomerate, and Mission Valley Formations which have high paleontological resource sensitivity. If grading associated with future development destroys fossil remains occurring within these formations, a significant impact would occur.

Rationale and Conclusion

Mitigation framework PALEO 6.10-1 assures that future discretionary projects implemented in accordance with the Uptown CPU would be screened by City staff to determine the potential for grading to impact sensitive geologic formations. If future development projects would exceed the grading thresholds specified in the mitigation framework, the City would require paleontological monitoring, which would ensure any inadvertent fossil discoveries during construction are identified, recovered, and handled in accordance with the required paleontological MMRP. Thus, implementation of the regulatory framework would reduce potentially significant impacts to paleontological resources for future discretionary projects (but not ministerial projects) within the Uptown CPU area to less than significant. Implementation of this mitigation framework would be assured because it would be incorporated into the project's MMRP.

B. Findings Regarding Mitigation Measures, which are the Responsibility of Another Agency (CEQA §21081(a)(2)) and CEQA Guidelines §15091(a)(2))

The City, having reviewed and considered the information contained in the Final PEIR and the Record of Proceedings, finds pursuant to CEQA §21081(a)(2) and CEQA Guidelines §15091(a)(2) that there are no changes or alterations, which could reduce significant impacts that are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency.

1. Traffic and Circulation – Freeway Segments and Ramp Meters

Significant Effect

a. Freeway Segments

- I-5 from Old Town Avenue to Imperial Avenue (Impact 6.3-33)
- I-8 from Hotel Circle West to SR-15 (Impact 6.3-34)
- SR-15 from I-805 to SR-94 (Impact 6.3-35)
- I-805 from I-8 to SR-15 (Impact 6.3-36)
- SR-94 from 25th Street to SR-15 (Impact 6.3-37)
- SR-163 from I-8 to I-5 (Impact 6.3-38)

b. Ramp Meters

- Hancock Street to I-5 southbound on-ramp in the PM peak period (Impact 6.3-39)
- Kettner Boulevard to I-5 southbound on-ramp in the PM peak period (Impact 6.3-40)
- Fifth Avenue to I-5 southbound on-ramp in the PM peak period (Impact 6.3-41)

Facts in Support of Finding

a. Freeway Segments

At the project-level, significant impacts at locations outside of the jurisdiction of the City could be partially mitigated in the form of fair share contribution or transportation demand management (TDM) measures that encourage carpooling and other alternative means of transportation consistent with proposed Uptown CPU policies. Fair share contributions could be provided toward the construction of the projects that are identified in SANDAG's San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan (RP) and in mitigation measures TRANS 6.3-34 through 6.3-37 listed below. The SANDAG RP did not identify any improvements to the I-5 segment from Old Town Avenue to Imperial Avenue (Impact 6.3-33) or to the SR-163 northbound from I-8 to Robinson Avenue and SR-163 southbound from I-8 to I-5 segments (Impact 6.3-38). Thus, no feasible mitigation has been identified to reduce this impact.

- Operational improvements along I-8 between I-5 and SR-125 (TRANS 6.3-34)
- Construction of managed lanes along SR-15 from I-5 to I-805 and from I-8 to SR-163 (TRANS 6.3-35)
- Construction of managed lanes along I-805 between SR-15 and SR-163 (TRANS 6.3-36)
- Construction of managed lanes along SR-94 between I-5 and SR-125. (TRANS 6.3-37)

b. Ramp Meters

At the project-level, significant impacts at locations outside of the jurisdiction of the City could be partially mitigated in the form of fair share contribution or transportation demand management (TDM) measures that encourage carpooling and other alternative means of transportation consistent with proposed Uptown CPU policies. TRANS 6.3-39 also requires the City of San Diego to coordinate with Caltrans to address ramp capacity at impacted on-ramp locations. Improvements could include, but are not limited to, additional lanes and interchange reconfiguration; however, specific capacity improvements are still undetermined by Caltrans, as future improvements require additional study to determine actual improvements that would address the identified impacts. However, future development projects could identify impacts and appropriate mitigation through project specific project transportation studies. Fair share contributions may be provided at the project level for impacted ramps where the impacted facility is identified in the SANDAG's RP.

Rationale and Conclusion

a. Freeway Segments

Implementation of the Uptown CPU and associated discretionary actions would result in a significant impact to the segment of I-8 from Hotel Circle West to SR-15 (Impact 6.3-34). The SANDAG RP identifies operational improvements along I-8 between I-5 to SR-125 (TRANS 6.3-34) that would partially mitigate this impact.

A significant impact is also identified along the segment of SR-15 from I-5 to I-805 and from I-8 to SR-163 (Impact 6.3-35). The SANDAG RP identifies construction of managed lanes along SR-15 from I-5 to I-805 and from I-8 to SR-163 (TRANS 6.3-35) that would partially mitigate this impact.

A significant impact is identified along the segment of I-805 from I-8 to SR-15 (Impact 6.3-36). The SANDAG RP identifies construction of managed lanes along I-805 between SR-15 to SR-163 (TRANS 6.3-36) that would partially mitigate this impact.

A significant impact is also identified along the segment of SR-94 from 25th Street to SR-15 (Impact 6.3-37). The SANDAG RP identifies construction of managed lanes from I-5 to SR-125. Caltrans is also evaluating alternatives to this measure as part of the environmental analysis for the SR-94 Express Lanes Project, including bus on shoulders and other multi-modal projects outlines in the Community Based Alternatives of the SR-94 Express Lanes Project. This measure (or an alternative measure) would provide partial mitigation, since it reduces the traffic demand on the freeway general purpose lanes (TRANS 6.3-37)

Although implementation of the SANDAG RP measures would partially mitigate these impacts, at a program level of analysis, actual development and associated traffic impacts for the Uptown CPU will materialize over time. In addition, there is uncertainty as to the timing of implementation of the improvements and whether the improvements will occur prior to the occurrence of the impacts. Regarding impacts, 6.3-33 and 6.3-38, the SANDAG RP did not identify any improvements to the I-5 segment from Old Town Avenue to Imperial Avenue (Impact 6.3-33) or to the SR-163 from I-8 to I-5 segments (Impact 6.3-38). Future development project's transportation studies would be able to more accurately identify individual project level impacts and provide the mechanism to mitigate them through fair share contributions in addition to the forecast funding planned by SANDAG and other funding sources consistent with the SANDAG RP. Thus, these freeway segment impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

b. Ramp Meters

Mitigation measures that would potentially reduce southbound ramp meter impacts include additional freeway lanes, interchange reconfiguration, implementation of TDM measures that encourage carpooling and other alternate means of alternative transportation, or a combination of these measures. At a program level of analysis, implementation of ramp improvements is infeasible because the City does not have approval authority over freeways. Actual development and associated traffic impacts for the CPU will materialize over time. In addition, there is uncertainty as to the timing of implementation of improvements and whether the improvements will occur prior to the occurrence of impacts. At the project level, future projects could make fair-share contributions to impacted ramps; however, only if these ramps are included in the SANDAG RP. None of the impacted segments are currently included within the SANDAG RP; thus, fair share funding for the impacted ramps is infeasible at this time. Future development project's transportation studies would be able to more accurately identify potential transportation impacts and provide the mechanism to mitigate them through project-specific mitigation including but not limited to physical improvements, fair share contribution, transportation demand management measures which may be more cost effective than alternative infrastructure improvements, or a combination of these measures. Thus, at a program level of analysis, the impact to ramp meters remains significant and unavoidable.

C. Findings Regarding Infeasible Mitigation Measures and Alternatives (CEQA §21081(a)(3) and CEQA Guidelines §15091(a)(3))

The following potentially significant impacts cannot be mitigated below a level of significance (Public Resource Code §21081(a) (3)):

1. Transportation and Circulation
 - Traffic Circulation
2. Noise
 - Ambient Noise
 - Vehicular Noise
 - Temporary Construction Noise (vibration during construction)
3. Historical Resources
 - Historic Structures, Objects, or Sites
 - Prehistoric Resources, Sacred Sites, and Human Remains
4. Paleontological Resources (for ministerial projects only)

Although mitigation measures are identified in the Final PEIR that could reduce significant impacts due to implementation of the proposed Uptown CPU, implementation of some of the mitigation measures cannot be assured since the degree of future impacts and applicability, feasibility, and success of future mitigation measures cannot be adequately known for each specific future project at the program level. "Feasible" is defined in Section 15364 of the CEQA Guidelines to mean "capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, social, and technological factors." The CEQA statute (Section 21081) and Guidelines (Section 15019(a)(3)) also provide that "other" considerations may form the basis for a finding of infeasibility. Case law makes clear that a mitigation measure or alternative can be deemed infeasible on the basis of its failure to meet project objectives or on related public policy grounds.

Relative to traffic and circulation, for those measures included in the IFS, full funding cannot be assured to implement these mitigation measures because the adequacy and timing of funding is not known and thus, the timing of completion of the improvements is uncertain. Other identified mitigation measures would not be consistent with the policy framework and goals of the proposed Uptown CPU. Thus, for these significant impacts, a finding of infeasibility is appropriate because there are no feasible mitigation measures available that would reduce the identified impacts to below a level of significance.

1. Transportation – Traffic Circulation

Significant Effect

The following cumulative impacts to intersections and roadway segments were determined to be significant:

a. Intersections

- Washington Street and Fourth Avenue (*Impact 6.3-1*)
- Washington Street and Eighth Avenue/ SR-163 Off-Ramp (*Impact 6.3-2*)
- Washington Street/ Normal Street and Campus Avenue/ Polk Avenue (*Impact 6.3-3*)
- University Avenue and Sixth Avenue (*Impact 6.3-4*)
- Elm Street and Sixth Avenue (*Impact 6.3-5*)
- Cedar Street and Second Avenue (*Impact 6.3-6*)

b. Roadway Segments

- First Avenue: Washington Street to Grape Street (*Impact 6.3-7*)
- Fourth Avenue: Arbor Drive to Washington Street (*Impact 6.3-8*)
- Fourth Avenue: Walnut Avenue to Laurel Street (*Impact 6.3-9*)
- Fifth Avenue: Robinson Avenue to Walnut Avenue (*Impact 6.3-10*)
- Sixth Avenue: Washington Street to Elm Street (*Impact 6.3-11*)
- Ninth Avenue: Washington Street to University Avenue (*Impact 6.3-12*)
- Campus Avenue/Polk Avenue: Washington Street to Park Boulevard (*Impact 6.3-13*)
- Cleveland Avenue: Tyler Street to Richmond Street (*Impact 6.3-14*)
- Fort Stockton Drive: Sunset Boulevard to Goldfinch Street (*Impact 6.3-15*)
- Grape Street: First Avenue to Sixth Avenue (*Impact 6.3-16*)
- Hawthorn Street: First Avenue to Sixth Avenue (*Impact 6.3-17*)
- India Street: Washington Street to Winder Street (*Impact 6.3-18*)
- India Street: Glenwood Drive Redwood Street (*Impact 6.3-19*)
- Laurel Street: Columbia Street to Sixth Avenue (*Impact 6.3-20*)
- Lincoln Avenue: Washington Street to Park Boulevard (*Impact 6.3-21*)
- Park Boulevard: Mission Avenue to El Cajon Boulevard (*Impact 6.3-22*)
- Park Boulevard: Robinson Avenue to Upas Street (*Impact 6.3-23*)
- Richmond Street: Cleveland Avenue to Upas Street (*Impact 6.3-24*)
- Robinson Avenue: First Avenue to Eighth Avenue (*Impact 6.3-25*)
- San Diego Avenue: Hortensia Street to Pringle Street (*Impact 6.3-26*)
- State Street: Laurel Street to Juniper Street (*Impact 6.3-27*)
- University Avenue: Ibis Street to Fifth Avenue (*Impact 6.3-28*)
- University Avenue: Sixth Avenue to Eighth Avenue (*Impact 6.3-29*)
- University Avenue: Normal Street to Park Boulevard (*Impact 6.3-30*)
- Washington Street: Fourth Avenue to Sixth Avenue (*Impact 6.3-31*)
- Washington Street: Richmond Street to Normal Street (*Impact 6.3-32*)

Facts in Support of Finding**a. Intersections*****Washington Street and Fourth Avenue (Impact 6.3-1)***

The Washington Street and Fourth Avenue intersection impact (Impact 6.3-1) could be mitigated to less than significant with implementation of mitigation measure TRANS 6.3-1, which would require widening Fourth Avenue in the southbound direction to add a second left-turn lane and restriping the southbound approach to be two left-turn lanes, one through lane, and one right-turn lane. to improve LOS to D or better.

Washington Street and Eighth Avenue/ SR-163 Off-Ramp (Impact 6.3-2)

The Washington Street and Eighth Avenue/SR-163 Off-Ramp intersection impact (Impact 6.3-2) could be mitigated to less than significant with implementation of mitigation measure TRANS 6.3-2, which would require widening Washington Street in the eastbound direction to four lanes and the westbound direction to three lanes; and widening the SR-163 Off-ramp to two lanes to improve LOS to D or better.

Washington Street/ Normal Street and Campus Avenue/ Polk Avenue (Impact 6.3-3)

The Washington Street and Normal Street and Campus Avenue/Polk Avenue intersection impact (Impact 6.3-3) could be mitigated to less than significant with implementation of mitigation measure TRANS 6.3-3, which would require widening Washington Street in the northeast direction to add an exclusive right-turn lane to improve LOS to D or better.

University Avenue and Sixth Avenue (Impact 6.3-4)

The University Avenue and Sixth Avenue intersection impact (Impact 6.3-4) could be mitigated to less than significant with implementation of mitigation measure TRANS 6.3-4, which would require widening Sixth Avenue in the southbound direction to add a second left-turn lane to improve LOS to D or better.

Elm Street and Sixth Avenue (Impact 6.3-5)

The Elm Street and Sixth Avenue intersection impact (Impact 6.3-5) could be mitigated to less than significant with implementation of mitigation measure TRANS 6.3-5, which would require widening Elm Street in the westbound direction to add a second right-turn lane to improve LOS to D or better.

Cedar Street and Second Avenue (Impact 6.3-6)

The Cedar Street and Second Avenue intersection impact (Impact 6.3-6) could be mitigated to less than significant with implementation of mitigation measure TRANS 6.3-6, which would require installing a traffic signal at this intersection to improve LOS to D or better.

b. Roadway Segments***First Avenue: Washington Street to Grape Street (Impact 6.3-7)***

The First Avenue segment from Washington Street to Grape Street functions as a north-south, two-way, 2-lane collector with no center lane. This roadway segment impact (Impact 6.3-7) could be mitigated to less than significant with implementation of mitigation measure TRANS 6.3-7, which would restripe the roadway to a 2-lane collector with a continuous left-turn lane from Washington Street to University Avenue. From University Avenue to Robinson Avenue, the impact could be mitigated to less than significant through widening the roadway to a 4-lane collector with a continuous left-turn lane. From Robinson Avenue to Grape Street, restriping to a 2-lane collector with a continuous left-turn lane would reduce the impact to less than significant. The Uptown IFS identifies a portion of this roadway segment (from Laurel Street to Hawthorn Street) as an improvement project. Installation of this measure would improve this roadway segment to LOS D or better.

Fourth Avenue: Arbor Drive to Washington Street (Impact 6.3-8)

The Fourth Avenue segment from Arbor Drive to Washington Street functions as a two-way, 2-lane collector. This roadway segment impact (Impact 6.3-8) could be mitigated to less than significant with implementation of mitigation measure TRANS 6.3-8, which would widen Fourth Avenue to a 4-lane collector with a continuous left-turn lane. This mitigation measure would restore operations to LOS D or better.

Fourth Avenue: Walnut Avenue to Laurel Street (Impact 6.3-9)

The Fourth Avenue segment from Walnut Avenue to Laurel Street functions as a one-way southbound 3-lane collector. This roadway segment impact (Impact 6.3-9) could be mitigated to less than significant with implementation of mitigation measure TRANS 6.3-9, which would restore the roadway to a 3-lane one-way collector for vehicles and remove the dedicated multi-modal lane. This mitigation measure would restore operations to LOS D or better.

Fifth Avenue: Robinson Avenue to Walnut Avenue (Impact 6.3-10)

The Fifth Avenue segment from Robinson Avenue to Walnut Avenue functions as a one-way northbound 3-lane collector. This roadway segment impact (Impact 6.3-10) could be mitigated to less than significant with implementation of mitigation measure TRANS 6.3-10, which would restore the roadway to a 3-lane one-way collector for vehicles and remove the dedicated multi-modal lane. This mitigation measure would restore operations to LOS D or better.

Sixth Avenue: Washington Street to Elm Street (Impact 6.3-11)

The Sixth Avenue segment from Washington Street to University Avenue functions as a 3-lane collector. The Sixth Avenue segment from University Avenue to Elm Street functions as a north-south 4-lane collector, with no center lane. This roadway segment impact (Impact 6.3-11) could be mitigated to less than significant with implementation of mitigation measure TRANS 6.3-11, which would widen the roadway to a 6-lane prime arterial from Washington Street to University Avenue. From University Avenue to Laurel Street, widening the roadway to a 4-lane major arterial would

reduce the impact to less than significant. From Laurel Street to Elm Street, widening the roadway to a 4-lane collector would reduce the impact to less than significant. This mitigation measure would restore operations to LOS D or better.

Ninth Avenue: Washington Street to University Avenue (Impact 6.3-12)

The Ninth Avenue segment from Washington Street to University Avenue functions as a two-way, north-south roadway. This roadway segment impact (Impact 6.3-12) could be mitigated to less than significant with implementation of mitigation measure TRANS 6.3-12, which would restripe the roadway to a 2-lane collector with a continuous left-turn lane. This mitigation measure would restore operations to LOS D or better.

Campus Avenue/Polk Avenue: Washington Street to Park Boulevard (Impact 6.3-13)

The Campus Avenue/ Polk Avenue segment from Washington Street to Park Boulevard functions as a north-south 2-lane collector. This roadway segment impact (Impact 6.3-13) could be mitigated to less than significant with implementation of mitigation measure TRANS 6.3-13, which would restripe the roadway to a 2-lane collector with a continuous left-turn lane. This mitigation measure would restore operations to LOS D or better.

Cleveland Avenue: Tyler to Richmond Street (Impact 6.3-14)

The Cleveland Avenue segment from Tyler to Richmond Street functions under its adopted Community Plan classification as a 2-lane collector. This roadway segment impact (Impact 6.3-14) could be mitigated to less than significant with implementation of mitigation measure TRANS 6.3-14, which would restripe the roadway to a 2-lane collector with a continuous left-turn lane. This mitigation measure would restore operations to LOS D or better.

Fort Stockton Drive: Sunset Boulevard to Goldfinch Street (Impact 6.3-15)

The Fort Stockton Drive segment from Sunset Boulevard to Goldfinch Street functions under its adopted Community Plan classification as a 2-lane collector. This roadway segment impact (Impact 6.3-15) could be mitigated to less than significant with implementation of mitigation measure TRANS 6.3-15, which would restripe the roadway to a 2-lane collector with a continuous left-turn lane. This mitigation measure would restore operations to LOS D or better.

Grape Street: First Avenue to Sixth Avenue (Impact 6.3-16)

The Grape Street segment from First Avenue to Sixth Avenue functions as a two-way, 2-lane collector. This roadway segment impact (Impact 6.3-16) could be mitigated to less than significant with implementation of mitigation measure TRANS 6.3-16, which would restripe the roadway to a 2-lane collector with a continuous left-turn lane from First Avenue to Third Avenue. From Third Avenue to Sixth Avenue, restriping the roadway to a 2-lane collector with a continuous left-turn lane would reduce the impact to less than significant. This mitigation measure would restore operations to LOS D or better.

Hawthorn Street: First Avenue to Sixth Avenue (Impact 6.3-17)

The Hawthorn Street segment from First Avenue to Sixth Avenue functions as a two-way, 2-lane collector. This roadway segment impact (Impact 6.3-17) could be mitigated to less than significant with implementation of mitigation measure TRANS 6.3-17, which would restripe the roadway to a 2-lane collector with a continuous left-turn lane from First Avenue to Third Avenue. From Third Avenue to Sixth Avenue, restriping the roadway to a 2-lane collector with continuous left-turn lane would reduce the impact to less than significant. This mitigation measure would restore operations to LOS D or better.

India Street: Washington Street to Winder Street (Impact 6.3-18)

The India Street segment from Washington Street to Winder Street functions as a two-way, 2-lane collector. This roadway segment impact (Impact 6.3-18) could be mitigated to less than significant with implementation of mitigation measure TRANS 6.3-18, which would restripe the roadway to a 2-lane collector with continuous left-turn lane. This mitigation measure would restore operations to LOS D or better.

India Street: Glenwood Drive to Redwood Street (Impact 6.3-19)

The India Street segment from Glenwood Drive to Redwood Street functions as a northbound, 2-lane collector. This roadway segment (Impact 6.3-19) could be mitigated to less than significant with implementation of mitigation measure TRANS 6.3-19, which would widen the roadway to a 4-lane one-way collector from Glenwood Drive to Sassafras Street. From Sassafras Street to Redwood Street, widening the roadway to a 3-lane one-way collector would reduce the impact to less than significant. This mitigation measure would restore operations to LOS D or better.

Laurel Street: Columbia Street to Sixth Avenue (Impact 6.3-20)

The Columbia Street to Sixth Avenue segment functions as an east-west 4-lane collector from Columbia to Union Street and as a 2-lane collector, with a two-way left turn lane from Union Street to Sixth Avenue. This roadway segment impact (Impact 6.3-20) could be mitigated to less than significant with implementation of mitigation measure TRANS 6.3-20, which would widen the roadway to a 4-lane collector. This mitigation measure would restore operations to LOS D or better.

Lincoln Avenue: Washington Street to Park Boulevard (Impact 6.3-21)

The Lincoln Avenue segment from Washington Street to Park Boulevard functions as a two-way, 2-lane collector. This roadway segment impact (Impact 6.3-21) could be mitigated to less than significant with implementation of mitigation measure TRANS 6.3-21, which would restripe the roadway to a 2-lane collector with a continuous left-turn lane. This mitigation measure would restore operations to LOS D or better.

Park Boulevard: Mission Avenue to El Cajon Boulevard (Impact 6.3-22)

The Park Boulevard segment from Mission Avenue to El Cajon Boulevard functions as a 3-lane collector. This roadway segment impact (Impact 6.3-22) could be mitigated to less than significant

with implementation of mitigation measure TRANS 6.3-22, which would widen the roadway to a 4-lane one-way collector. This mitigation measure would restore operations to LOS D or better.

Park Boulevard: Robinson Avenue to Upas Street (Impact 6.3-23)

The Robinson Avenue to Upas Street functions as a 3-lane collector from Robinson to Cypress Avenue and as a north-south, 2-lane collector, with a two-way left-turn lane between Cypress Avenue and Upas Street. This roadway segment impact (Impact 6.3-23) could be mitigated to less than significant with implementation of mitigation measure TRANS 6.3-23, which would widen the roadway to a 4-lane one-way collector. This mitigation measure would restore operations to LOS D or better.

Richmond Street: Cleveland Avenue to Upas Street (Impact 6.3-24)

The Richmond Street segment from Cleveland Avenue to Upas Street functions as a north-south 2-lane collector. This roadway segment impact (Impact 6.3-24) could be mitigated to less than significant with implementation of mitigation measure TRANS 6.3-24, which would restripe the roadway to a 2-lane collector with a continuous left-turn lane. The Uptown IFS identifies a portion of this roadway segment (from Cleveland Avenue to Robinson Avenue) as an improvement project. This mitigation measure would restore operations to LOS D or better.

Robinson Avenue: First to Eighth Avenue (Impact 6.3-25)

The Robinson Avenue segment from First to Eighth Avenue functions as an east-west 2-lane collector. This roadway segment impact (Impact 6.3-25) could be mitigated to less than significant with implementation of mitigation measure TRANS 6.3-25, which would restripe the roadway to a 2-lane collector with continuous left-turn lane from First to Third Avenue. From Third Avenue to Eighth Avenue, widening the roadway to a 4-lane collector would reduce the impact to less than significant. This mitigation measure would restore operations to LOS D or better.

San Diego Avenue: Hortensia Street to Pringle Street (Impact 6.3-26)

The San Diego Avenue segment from Hortensia Street to Pringle Street functions as a 2-lane collector. This roadway segment impact (Impact 6.3-26) could be mitigated to less than significant with implementation of mitigation measure TRANS 6.3-26, which would restripe the roadway to a 2-lane collector with a continuous left-turn lane. This mitigation measure would restore operations to LOS D or better.

State Street: Laurel Street to Juniper Street (Impact 6.3-27)

The State Street functions as a 2-lane collector between Laurel Street and Juniper Street. This roadway segment impact (Impact 6.3-27) could be mitigated to less than significant with implementation of mitigation measure TRANS 6.3-27, which would restripe the roadway to a 2-lane collector with continuous left-turn lane. This improvement project is identified in the Uptown IFS. This mitigation measure would restore operations to LOS D or better.

University Avenue: Ibis Street to Fifth Avenue (Impact 6.3-28)

The University Avenue segment from Ibis Street to Fifth Avenue functions as an east-west 2-lane collector. This roadway segment impact (Impact 6.3-28) could be mitigated to less than significant with implementation of mitigation measure TRANS 6.3-28, which would widen the roadway to a 4-lane collector. This mitigation measure would restore operations to LOS D or better.

University Avenue: Sixth Avenue to Eighth Avenue (Impact 6.3-29)

The University Avenue segment from Sixth Avenue to Eighth Avenue functions as a 4-lane collector that varies with or without a center lane. This roadway segment impact (Impact 6.3-29) could be mitigated to less than significant with implementation of mitigation measure TRANS 6.3-29, which would widen the roadway to a 4-lane major arterial and install a raised median. This mitigation measure would restore operations to LOS D or better.

University Avenue: Normal Street to Park Boulevard (Impact 6.3-30)

The University Avenue segment from Normal Street to Park Boulevard functions as a 4-lane collector. This roadway segment impact (Impact 6.3-30) could be mitigated to less than significant with implementation of mitigation measure TRANS 6.3-30, which would widen the roadway to a 4-lane collector. This mitigation measure would restore operations to LOS D or better.

Washington Street: Fourth Avenue to Sixth Avenue (Impact 6.3-31)

The Washington Street segment from Fourth Avenue to Sixth Avenue functions at its adopted Community Plan classification as an east-west 4-lane major. This roadway segment impact (Impact 6.3-31) could be mitigated to less than significant with implementation of mitigation measure TRANS 6.3-31, which would widen the roadway to a 6-lane major arterial. This mitigation measure would restore operations to LOS D or better.

Washington Street: Richmond Street to Normal Street (Impact 6.3-32)

The Washington Street segment from Richmond Street to Normal Street functions as a 6-lane major. This roadway segment impact (Impact 6.3-32) could be mitigated to less than significant with implementation of mitigation measure TRANS 6.3-32, which would restripe the roadway to a 6-lane prime arterial and remove on-street parking. This mitigation measure would restore operations to LOS D or better.

Rationale and Conclusion

Although improvements are identified in the Final PEIR that would reduce impacts to local roadways and intersections, the City is unable to rely on these measures to reduce the impacts to less than significant levels for three reasons. First (1), for those mitigation measures that are included in the IFS, full funding for the construction of improvements and timing of construction cannot be assured at the time the improvement is needed. Second (2), although some of the identified improvements would reduce traffic congestion, their implementation would be contrary to achieving the smart growth goals of the General Plan, Uptown CPU, and Climate Action Plan (CAP). Lastly (3), surrounding development restricts the ability to obtain sufficient right-of-way to construct some of the identified

improvements. Thus, impacts of the Project on local roadway segments and intersections will be significant and unavoidable. Findings for specific intersection and street segments impacts are discussed below with reference to the three reasons for infeasibility (1, 2 and/or 3).

a. Intersections

Washington Street and Fourth Avenue (Impact 6.3-1)

The current configuration of the southbound approach includes a single left turn lane. A dual left turn lane is required to mitigate the project impact. Widening the southbound approach to accommodate a dual left turn lane would require right-of-way acquisition, which would require removal of frontage and possible building area from two existing commercial properties. Widening this roadway would be inconsistent with proposed Uptown CPU Policy UD-3.35 to support traffic calming by reducing vehicle travel lanes. This improvement would require removal of 10 on-street parking spaces in an area that has a number of businesses that rely on off-street parking. This would conflict with Mobility Element Policy MO-7.13 which supports on-street parking on all streets to support adjacent uses and enhance pedestrian safety and activity. The improvement would also increase pedestrian crossing distances, which would conflict with a number of proposed Uptown CPU Mobility Element policies that promote a pedestrian scale environment and improvements to enhance the pedestrian experience including proposed Uptown CPU Policy UD-3.43 which calls for narrowing of streets. Therefore, the impact at this location would be significant and unavoidable. (Infeasibility Category: 2, 3)

Washington Street and Eighth Avenue/SR-163 Off Ramp (Impact 6.3-2)

Implementation of TRANS 6.3-2 would require widening Washington Street in the eastbound direction to four lanes and the westbound direction to three lanes and widening the off-ramp for SR-163 to two lanes. Right-of-way (ROW) acquisition would be needed, affecting available frontage at one residential and four commercial properties. The improvement would also increase pedestrian crossing distances which would conflict with a number of proposed Uptown CPU Mobility Element policies that promote a pedestrian scale environment and improvements to enhance the pedestrian experience. Widening would be inconsistent with proposed Uptown CPU Policy UD-3.35 to support traffic calming by reducing vehicle travel lanes. The improvement would require removal of 15 on-street parking spaces, in an area that has a number of businesses that rely on off-street parking. This would conflict with Mobility Element Policy MO-7.13, which supports on-street parking on all streets to support adjacent uses and enhance pedestrian safety and activity. Therefore, the impact at this location would be significant and unavoidable. (Infeasibility Category: 2, 3)

Washington Street/Normal Street/Campus Avenue/Polk Avenue (Impact 6.3-3)

An additional exclusive right turn lane would be needed to fully improve the LOS at this location to LOS D or better. Widening the northeast bound approach to accommodate an exclusive right turn lane would require right-of-way acquisition, which would result in taking property frontage from a commercial property for road purposes. The improvement would also adversely affect vehicular turning radius, and would require reconfiguration of the pedestrian island. Widening this roadway would be inconsistent with proposed Uptown CPU Policy UD-3.35 to support traffic calming by reducing vehicle travel lanes. This improvement would also not be consistent with multiple policies related to pedestrian safety and walkability in the Uptown CPU. A mitigation measure to add lane

capacity would not support the Uptown CPU objective to develop a multi-modal transportation network emphasizing active transportation measures for walkable and bicycle-friendly streets, and transit-related measures supporting transit operations and access. This improvement could also adversely affect the existing Rapid Bus lane at this location. Therefore, the impact at this location would be significant and unavoidable. (Infeasibility Category: 2, 3)

University Avenue/Sixth Avenue (Impact 6.3-4)

Implementation of TRANS 6.3-4 involves widening Sixth Avenue in the southbound direction to add a second left-turn lane. Widening the southbound approach to accommodate a dual left turn lane would require right of way acquisition, which would require taking portions of two commercial properties, removing sidewalks in a heavily used pedestrian location, and would increase pedestrian crossing distance. This improvement would conflict with the proposed Uptown CPU pedestrian oriented policies that support a pedestrian scale environment and enhanced pedestrian amenities. Therefore, the impact at this location would be significant and unavoidable. (Infeasibility Category: 2, 3)

Elm Street and Sixth Avenue (Impact 6.3-5)

Implementation of TRANS 6.3-5 would involve widening Elm Street in the westbound direction to add a second right-turn lane. This improvement would impact require the removal or relocation of a planned bicycle facility along Sixth Avenue. The widening would be inconsistent with the Bicycle Master Plan and proposed Uptown CPU Policies UD-3.39 for the incorporation of bicycle lanes and MO-4.1 related to a complete streets network. An improvement which removes a bicycle lane would also not be consistent with additional policies in the Mobility Element, including Policy MO-2.4 to support bicycle facilities on Sixth Avenue and Policy MO-4.9 to implement road diets and traffic calming measures to increase walking and bicycling in Uptown. Thus, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable. (Infeasibility Category: 2)

Cedar Street and Second Avenue (Impact 6.3-6)

Implementation of TRANS 6.3-6 involves installing a traffic signal at this intersection. However, this intersection is located outside the boundaries of the Uptown CPU area; improvements outside of the Uptown CPU cannot be included in the IFS for Uptown as funds collected and associated with the Uptown CPU cannot fund improvements outside of the Uptown CPU area. This intersection is in the Downtown Community Plan area. While it is not specifically called out in the financing plan for Downtown, it would be considered an eligible expenditure for that community plan area. However, implementation of this measure cannot be guaranteed because the IFS for the Downtown Community Plan area would not fully fund the improvement and there is no guarantee that this mitigation measure would be implemented prior to occurrence of the impact. Therefore, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable. (Infeasibility Category: 1).

b. Roadway Segments

First Avenue

The functional classification of these roadway segments is a 2-lane collector with no center lane. Installation of a continuous left turn lane would fully mitigate the impact at all segments. This could be achieved by either restriping or roadway widening.

Washington Avenue to University Avenue and Robinson Avenue to Grape Street (Impact 6.3-7)

Due to the narrow width of the road along these segments, , restriping would require the removal of approximately 139 on-street parking spaces in an area that has a number of businesses that rely on off-street parking. This would conflict with Mobility Element Policy MO-7.13, which supports on-street parking on all streets to support adjacent uses and enhance pedestrian safety and activity. Therefore, the measure would be infeasible and the impact at this location would be significant and unavoidable. (Infeasibility Category: 2, 3)

University Avenue to Robinson Avenue (Impact 6.3-7)

Widening would increase pedestrian crossing distances and would impact approximately 13 residential and one commercial structure by removing property frontage. This improvement would increase pedestrian crossing distance and impact sidewalks which would conflict with the proposed Uptown CPU pedestrian oriented policies that support a pedestrian scale environment and enhanced pedestrian amenities. Therefore, the measure would be infeasible and the impact at this location would be significant and unavoidable. (Infeasibility Category: 2, 3)

Laurel Street to Hawthorne Street (Impact 6.3-7)

The improvement to restripe from Laurel Street to Hawthorn Street to a 2-lane collector with continuous left-turn lane is identified in the Uptown IFS. However, because the IFS would not fully fund the improvement and there is no guarantee this mitigation measure would be implemented prior to occurrence of the impact, it would remain significant and unavoidable. (Infeasibility Category: 1).

Laurel Street to Hawthorn Street (Impact 6.3-7)

This improvement is identified in the Uptown IFS. However, because the IFS would not fully fund the improvement and there is no guarantee this mitigation measure would be implemented prior to occurrence of the impact, it would remain significant and unavoidable. (Infeasibility Category: 1)

Fourth Avenue

Arbor Drive to Washington Street (Impact 6.3-8)

The functional classification of this roadway segment is 2-lane collector with no center lane. Widening to a 4-lane collector with continuous left turn lane would fully mitigate the impact at this location. However, the improvement would increase crossing distance for pedestrians and would impact seven residential and seven commercial structures by removing usable property frontage. This improvement would conflict with the proposed Uptown CPU pedestrian oriented policies that

support a pedestrian scale environment and enhanced pedestrian amenities. Therefore, the measure is infeasible and the impact at this location would remain significant and unavoidable. (Infeasibility Category: 2, 3)

Walnut Avenue to Laurel Street (Impact 6.3-9)

The functional classification of this roadway segment is 3-lane collector (one-way with one lane dedicated for a multimodal facility). Restriping to a 3 lane one-way collector would fully mitigate the impact at this location. However, this would require the removal of a bike lane which would conflict with the Bicycle Master Plan and proposed Uptown CPU Mobility Element policies that prioritize multi-modal transportation options and bicycle facilities. Thus, the improvement would be infeasible and the impact at this location would be significant and unavoidable. (Infeasibility Category: 2)

Fifth Avenue

Robinson Avenue to Walnut Avenue (Impact 6.3-10)

The functional classification of this roadway segment is 3-lane collector. This is a one-way road with one lane dedicated for a multi-modal facility. Restriping to a 3 lane one-way collector would fully mitigate the impact at this location. Implementation of mitigation measure TRANS 6.3-10 would require restoring the roadway to a 3 lane one-way collector for vehicles. This improvement would be inconsistent with proposed Uptown CPU Policies UD-3.35 to support traffic calming by reducing vehicle travel lanes, UD-3.39 incorporation of bicycle lanes, Policy MO-2.4 to support bicycle facilities on Fifth Avenue, and MO-4.1 related to a complete streets network. Thus, the improvement would be infeasible and the impact at this location would be significant and unavoidable. (Infeasibility Category: 2)

Sixth Avenue

Washington Street to University Avenue (Impact 6.3-11)

The Sixth Avenue segment from Washington Street to University Avenue has a functional classification of 3 lane two-way collector. Widening to 6 lane prime arterial would fully mitigate the impact at this location. The Sixth Avenue segment from University Avenue to Laurel Street has a functional classification of 4 lane collector with no center lane. Installation of a raised median for classification as a 4 lane major arterial would fully mitigate the impact at this location. The Sixth Avenue segment from Laurel Street to Elm Street has a functional classification of 2 lane collector with continuous left turn lane. Widening to a 4 lane collector with continuous left turn lane would fully mitigate the impact at this location. Implementation of mitigation measure TRANS 6.3-11 would increase crossing distance for pedestrians. This would not be consistent with multiple policies related to pedestrian safety and walkability in the Uptown CPU, including Policy MO-4.9 to implement road diets and traffic calming measures where appropriate to improve safety and walkability. From Washington Street to University Avenue, the improvements would impact 3 commercial structures. From University Avenue to Laurel Street the improvements would require ROW acquisition affecting approximately 44 residential and 19 commercial structures by removing usable frontage. From Laurel Street to Elm Street ROW acquisitions would affect approximately 10 residential and 5 commercial structures. The widening would be inconsistent with proposed Uptown CPU Policies UD-3.35 to support traffic calming by reducing vehicle travel lanes and UD-3.43, which

calls for narrowing of streets. Therefore, the impact at this location would remain significant and unavoidable. (Infeasibility Category: 2, 3)

Ninth Avenue

Washington Street to University Avenue (Impact 6.3-12)

The Ninth Avenue segment from Washington Street to University Avenue has a functional classification of a 2 lane collector with no center lane. Installation of a continuous left turn lane would fully mitigate the impact at this location. Implementation of mitigation measure TRANS 6.3-12 would require the removal of approximately 8 on-street parking spaces. Given that parking is heavily utilized in this area, removal of on-street parking would not be consistent with Uptown CPU Policy MO-7.13 to support on-street parking to support adjacent uses. Alternatively, this roadway segment could be widened to accommodate a continuous left turn lane. However, street widening would increase crossing distance for pedestrians would not be consistent with Policy UD-3.43 which calls for narrowing of streets and multiple policies related to pedestrian safety and walkability in the Uptown CPU, including Policy MO-4.9 to implement road diets and traffic calming measures where appropriate to improve safety and walkability. Thus, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable. (Infeasibility Category: 2)

Campus Avenue/Polk Avenue

Washington Street to Park Boulevard (Impact 6.3-13)

The Campus Avenue/ Polk Avenue segment from Washington Street to Park Boulevard has a functional classification of a 2 lane collector with no center lane. Installation of a continuous left turn lane would fully mitigate the impact at this location. Implementation of mitigation measure TRANS 6.3-13 would require the removal of approximately 5 on-street parking spaces (converting 11 diagonal parking spaces to 5 parallel parking spaces along the north side of the street). Given that parking is heavily utilized in this area, removal of on-street parking is inconsistent with proposed Uptown CPU Policy MO-7.13 to support on-street parking to support adjacent uses. Alternatively, this roadway segment could be widened to accommodate a continuous left turn lane. However, street widening would increase crossing distance for pedestrians, which is not consistent with policies related to pedestrian safety and walkability in the Uptown CPU and would also require ROW acquisition affecting Saint John the Evangelist Catholic Church. Therefore, the impact at this location would remain significant and unavoidable. (Infeasibility Category: 2, 3)

Cleveland Avenue

Tyler Street to Richmond Street (Impact 6.3-14)

The Cleveland Avenue segment from Tyler Street to Richmond Street has a functional classification of a 2 lane collector with no center lane. Installation of a continuous left turn lane would fully mitigate the impact at this location. Implementation of mitigation measure TRANS 6.3-14 would require the removal of approximately 35 on-street parking spaces and result in impact to an existing Class II bicycle facility. Given that parking is heavily utilized in this area, removal of on-street parking is inconsistent with proposed Uptown CPU Policy MO-7.13 to support on-street parking. Bicycle facilities and connections are also protected by multiple policies in the Mobility Element of the

proposed Uptown CPU. Alternatively, these roadway segments could be widened to accommodate a continuous left turn lane. However, street widening would impact fronting properties and increase crossing distance for pedestrians, which is not consistent with Uptown CPU Policy UD-3.43 and Policy MO-4.9 to implement road diets and traffic calming measures. A mitigation measure to add lane capacity would conflict with the Bicycle Master Plan and would not support the Uptown CPU objective to develop a multi-modal transportation network emphasizing active transportation measures for walkable and bicycle-friendly streets, and transit-related measures supporting transit operations and access. Thus, the measure is infeasible and the impact at this location would remain significant and unavoidable. (Infeasibility Category: 2)

Fort Stockton Drive

Sunset Boulevard to Goldfinch Street (Impact 6.3-15)

The Fort Stockton Drive segment from Sunset Boulevard to Goldfinch Street has a functional classification of a 2 lane collector with no center lane. Installation of a continuous left turn lane would fully mitigate the impact at this location. Implementation of mitigation measure TRANS 6.3-15 would require the removal of approximately 113 on-street parking spaces. Given that parking is heavily utilized in this area, removal of on-street parking is inconsistent with proposed Uptown CPU Policy MO-7.13 to support on-street parking. Alternatively, this roadway segment could be widened to accommodate a continuous left turn lane. However, street widening would impact fronting properties and increase crossing distance for pedestrians, which is not consistent with policies related to pedestrian safety and walkability and Policy UD-3.43 which calls for narrowing of streets. Thus, the measure is infeasible and the impact at this location would remain significant and unavoidable. (Infeasibility Category: 2)

Grape Street

First Avenue to Sixth Avenue (Impact 6.3-16)

The Grape Street segment from First Avenue to Sixth Avenue has a functional classification of a 2 lane collector with no center lane. Installation of a continuous left turn lane would fully mitigate the impact at this location. Implementation of mitigation measure TRANS 6.3-16 would require the removal of approximately 84 on-street parking spaces. Given that parking is heavily utilized in this area, removal of on-street parking is inconsistent with proposed Uptown CPU Policy MO-7.13 to support on-street parking. Alternatively, this roadway segment could be widened to accommodate a continuous left turn lane. However, a mitigation measure to add lane capacity would not support the Bicycle Master Plan or the Uptown CPU objective to develop a multi-modal transportation network emphasizing active transportation measures for walkable and bicycle-friendly streets, and transit-related measures supporting transit operations and access. Thus, the measure is infeasible and the impact at this location would remain significant and unavoidable. (Infeasibility Category: 2)

Hawthorn Street

First Avenue to Sixth Avenue (Impact 6.3-17)

The Hawthorn Street segment from First Avenue to Sixth Avenue has a functional classification of a 2 lane collector with no center lane. Installation of a continuous left turn lane would fully mitigate the

impact at this location. Implementation of mitigation measure TRANS 6.3-17 would require the removal of approximately 25 on-street parking spaces. Given that parking is heavily utilized in this area, removal of on-street parking is not consistent with proposed Uptown CPU Policy MO-7.13 to support on-street parking. Thus, the measure is infeasible and the impact at this location would remain significant and unavoidable. (Infeasibility Category: 2)

India Street

Washington Street to Winder Street (Impact 6.3-18)

The functional classification of this roadway segment is 2-lane collector with no center lane. Installation of a continuous left turn lane would fully mitigate the impact at this location. This could be achieved by restriping. Restriping would require the removal of approximately 25 heavily used on-street parking spaces. Parking along this segments support adjacent businesses and provides a buffer between the pedestrian walkway and the street, which enhances the pedestrian environment. This improvement would conflict with the proposed CPU Mobility Element goals for “safe, walkable neighborhoods which utilize pedestrian connections and improved sidewalks to create a comfortable pedestrian experience”. Mobility Element Policy MO-4.9 also supports implementing road diets and traffic calming measures where appropriate to improve safety and quality of service, and increase walking and bicycling in Uptown. Mobility Element Policy MO-7.13 which supports on-street parking on all streets to support adjacent uses and enhance pedestrian safety and activity. Thus, this measure would be infeasible because it would conflict with proposed Uptown CPU Mobility Element goals and policies. Thus, the measure is infeasible and the impact at this location would remain significant and unavoidable. (Infeasibility Category: 2)

Glenwood Drive to Sassafras Street (Impact 6.3-19)

The functional classification of this roadway segment is 2-lane one-way collector. A 4-lane one-way collector would fully mitigate the impact at this location. Widening this roadway segment to a 4-lane one-way collector would increase crossing distance for pedestrians, require the removal of approximately 22 on-street parking spaces that support adjacent businesses, and would impact approximately two residential and five commercial structures by removing usable frontage for road purposes. This improvement would conflict with proposed CPU Mobility Element goals for “safe, walkable neighborhoods which utilize pedestrian connections and improved sidewalks to create a comfortable pedestrian experience”. Mobility Element Policy MO-4.9 supports implementing road diets and traffic calming measures where appropriate to improve safety and quality of service, and increase walking and bicycling in Uptown. Mobility Element Policy MO-7.13, which supports on-street parking on all streets to support adjacent uses and enhance pedestrian safety and activity. Thus, the measure is infeasible and the impact at this location would remain significant and unavoidable. (Infeasibility Category: 2, 3)

Sassafras Street to Redwood Street (Impact 6.3-19)

The functional classification of this roadway segment is 2-lane one-way collector. A 3-lane one-way collector would fully mitigate the impact at this location. However, widening this roadway segment to a 3-lane one-way collector is infeasible because it would conflict with proposed Uptown CPU goals and policies. Specifically, it would increase crossing distance for pedestrians and require the removal of 10 on-street parking spaces that support adjacent businesses. Mobility Element Policy MO-4.9

supports implementing road diets and traffic calming measures where appropriate to improve safety and quality of service, and increase walking and bicycling in Uptown. Mobility Element Policy MO-7.13, which supports on-street parking on all streets to support adjacent uses and enhance pedestrian safety and activity. The improvement would also impact approximately three residential and six commercial structures by removing frontage for road purposes which would also conflict with the aforementioned Mobility Element policies. Thus, the measure is infeasible and the impact at this location would remain significant and unavoidable. (Infeasibility Category: 2, 3)

Laurel Street

Columbia Street to Sixth Avenue (Impact 6.3-20)

The Laurel Street segment from Columbia Street to Union Street has a functional classification of a 4 lane collector with no center lane. Installation of a continuous left turn lane would fully mitigate the impact at this location. Laurel Street from Union Street to Sixth Avenue is 2 lane collector with continuous left turn lane. Widening to a 4 lane collector with continuous left turn lane would fully mitigate the impact at this location. Implementation of mitigation measure TRANS 6.3-20 would increase crossing distance for pedestrians and would impact approximately 14 commercial and 31 residential structures. In addition, implementation of this mitigation measure would require additional ROW acquisitions from Union Street to Sixth Avenue. Widening roadways and increasing crossing distance is also not consistent with Uptown CPU Policy UD-3.43 which calls for narrowing of streets, Policy MO-7.13 to support on-street parking, and policies related to pedestrian safety and walkability in the Uptown CPU.

The functional classification of this roadway segment is 4-lane collector with no center lane. Installation of a continuous left turn lane would fully mitigate the impact at this location. This could be achieved by either restriping. Widening these roadway segments to accommodate a continuous left turn lane would increase crossing distance for pedestrians and would impact approximately one commercial and eight residential structures, which is detrimental to community character. Thus, the measure is infeasible and the impact at this location would remain significant and unavoidable. (Infeasibility Category: 2, 3)

Lincoln Avenue

Washington Street to Park Boulevard (Impact 6.3-21)

The Lincoln Avenue segment from Washington Street to Park Boulevard has a functional classification of a 2 lane collector with no center lane. Installation of a continuous left turn lane could be achieved by restriping and would fully mitigate the impact at this location; however removal of approximately 21 on-street parking spaces would be required. Given that parking is heavily utilized in this area, removal of on-street parking is not consistent with Uptown CPU Policy MO-7.13 to support on-street parking. Thus, the measure is infeasible and the impact at this location would remain significant and unavoidable. (Infeasibility Category: 2)

Park Boulevard

Mission Avenue to El Cajon Boulevard (Impact 6.3-22)

The Park Boulevard segment from Mission Avenue to El Cajon Boulevard has a functional classification of a 3 lane collector with no center lane. Widening to a 4 lane one-way collector would fully mitigate the impact at this location. Implementation of mitigation measure TRANS 6.3-22 would require an increase in the crossing distance for pedestrians and would require removal of 2 shared use bicycle facilities and require ROW acquisition from approximately 7 commercial structures. Mobility Element Policy MO-4.9 supports implementing road diets and traffic calming measures where appropriate to improve safety and quality of service, and increase walking and bicycling in Uptown. Mobility Element Policy MO-7.13, which supports on-street parking on all streets to support adjacent uses and enhance pedestrian safety and activity. Implementation of this mitigation measure would conflict with the Bicycle Master Plan and multiple policies in the Uptown CPU which support multi-modal facilities. Thus, the measure is infeasible and the impact at this location would remain significant and unavoidable. (Infeasibility Category: 2, 3)

Robinson Avenue to Upas Street (Impact 6.3-23)

The Park Boulevard segment from Robinson Avenue to Upas Street has a functional classification of a 2 lane collector with continuous left turn lane. Widening to a 4 lane one-way collector would fully mitigate the impact at this location. Implementation of mitigation measure TRANS 6.3-23 would require an increase in the crossing distance for pedestrians and would require removal of 2 shared use bicycle facilities and require ROW acquisition from approximately 8 residential structures. The widening and loss of bicycle facilities would not be consistent with multiple proposed policies related to complete streets, including Uptown CPU Policy UD-3.35 to support traffic calming by reducing vehicle travel lanes and Policy UD-3.39 for the incorporation of bicycle lanes in the Uptown community. This improvement would also not be consistent with the Bicycle Master Plan and Mobility Element policies in the Uptown CPU, including Policy MO-4.1 related to a complete streets network, Policy MO-2.5 to support bicycle facilities on Robinson Avenue and Park Boulevard, and Policy MO-4.9 to implement road diets and traffic calming measures to improve quality of service for bicycling. Thus, the measure is infeasible and the impact at this location would remain significant and unavoidable. (Infeasibility Category: 2, 3)

Richmond Street

Cleveland Avenue to Robinson Avenue (Impact 6.3-24)

The functional classification of this roadway segment is 2-lane collector with no center lane. Restriping to 2-lane collector with continuous left turn lane would fully mitigate the impact at this location. However, because the IFS would not fully fund the improvement and there is no guarantee this mitigation measure would be implemented prior to occurrence of the impact, it would remain significant and unavoidable. (Infeasibility Category: 1)

Robinson Avenue to Upas Street (Impact 6.3-24)

The functional classification of this roadway segment is 2-lane collector with no center lane. Installation of a continuous left turn lane would fully mitigate the impact at this location. This could

be achieved by either restriping or roadway widening. However, restriping would require the removal of approximately 74 on-street parking spaces. Given that parking is heavily utilized in this area, removal of on-street parking or widening roadways and increasing crossing distance is not consistent with Uptown CPU Policy UD-3.43 which calls for narrowing of streets and policies related to pedestrian safety and walkability in the Uptown CPU and Mobility Element Policy MO-7.13, which supports on-street parking on all streets to support adjacent uses and enhance pedestrian safety and activity. Thus, the measure is infeasible and the impact at this location would remain significant and unavoidable. (Infeasibility Category: 2)

Robinson Avenue

First Avenue to Eighth Avenue (Impact 6.3-25)

The Robinson Avenue segment has a functional classification of a 2 lane collector with no center lane. Installation of a continuous left turn lane from First Avenue to Third Avenue and widening to a 4 lane collector with continuous left turn lane from Third Avenue to Eighth Avenue would fully mitigate the impact at this location. However, implementation of mitigation measure TRANS 6.3-25 would require restriping or roadway widening. Restriping would require the removal of approximately 16 on-street parking spaces while widening would increase crossing distance for pedestrians, and impact 2 shared use bicycle facilities and approximately 11 residential and 13 commercial structures. Given that parking is heavily utilized in this area, removal of on-street parking, street widening, and impacts to bicycle facilities on Robinson Avenue would not be consistent with proposed Uptown CPU Policy UD-3.35 to support traffic calming by reducing vehicle travel lanes, Policy UD-3.39 incorporation of bicycle lanes, Policy UD-3.43 which calls for narrowing of streets, Policy MO-4.1 related to a complete streets network, Policy MO-7.13 to support on-street parking, and Policy MO-2.5 to support bicycle facilities on Robinson Avenue, and Policy MO-4.9 to implement road diets and traffic calming measures. A mitigation measure to add lane capacity would not support the Uptown CPU objective to develop a multi-modal transportation network emphasizing active transportation measures for walkable and bicycle-friendly streets, and transit-related measures supporting transit operations and access. Thus, the measure is infeasible and the impact at this location would remain significant and unavoidable. (Infeasibility Category: 2, 3)

San Diego Avenue

Hortensia Street to Pringle Street (Impact 6.3-26)

The San Diego Avenue segment from Hortensia Street to Pringle Street has a functional classification of a 2 lane collector with no center lane. Installation of a continuous left turn lane would fully mitigate the impact at this location. Implementation of mitigation measure TRANS 6.3-26 would require the removal of approximately 32 on-street parking spaces. Given that parking is heavily utilized in this area, removal of on-street parking is not consistent with Policy MO-7.13 to support on-street parking in Uptown. Alternatively, this roadway segment could be widened to accommodate a continuous left turn lane. However, street widening would increase crossing distance for pedestrians which would not be consistent with multiple policies related to complete streets, walkability, and safety. Thus, the measure is infeasible and the impact at this location would remain significant and unavoidable. (Infeasibility Category: 2)

State Street

Laurel Street to Juniper Street (Impact 6.3-27)

The State Street segment from Laurel Street to Juniper Street has a functional classification of a 2 lane collector with no center lane. Installation of a continuous left turn lane would fully mitigate the impact at this location. Implementation of mitigation measure TRANS 6.3-27 is identified in the Uptown IFS. However, because the IFS would not fully fund the improvement and there is no guarantee this mitigation measure would be implemented prior to occurrence of the impact, it would remain significant and unavoidable. (Infeasibility Category: 1)

University Avenue

Ibis Street to Fifth Avenue (Impact 6.3-28)

The University Avenue segment from Ibis Street to First Avenue has a functional classification of a 2 lane collector with no center lane. The University Avenue segment from First Avenue to Fifth Avenue is 2 lane collector with no fronting property between First Avenue and Fourth Avenue; and a continuous left turn lane between Fourth Avenue and Fifth Avenue. Widening to 4 lane collector with continuous left turn lane would fully mitigate the impacts at these locations. Implementation of mitigation measure TRANS 6.3-28 would increase crossing distance for pedestrians along this segment of University. It would also impact 40 residential and 5 commercial properties from Ibis Street to First Avenue, 25 commercial properties from First Avenue to Fourth Avenue, and an additional 25 commercial properties from Fourth Avenue to Fifth Avenue by property frontage for road purposes. This mitigation measure would not be consistent with multiple proposed policies in the Uptown CPU related to complete streets, including Policy UD-3.35 to support traffic calming by reducing vehicle travel lanes, Policy UD-3.43 which calls for narrowing of streets, Policy MO-4.1 related to a complete streets network, and Policy MO-4.9 to implement road diets. Thus, the measure is infeasible and the impact at this location would remain significant and unavoidable. (Infeasibility Category: 2, 3)

Sixth Avenue to Eighth Avenue (Impact 6.3-29)

The University Avenue segment from Sixth Avenue to Eighth Avenue has a functional classification of a 4 lane collector with no center lane. Widening to a 4 lane major arterial would fully mitigate the impact at this location. Implementation of mitigation measure TRANS 6.3-29 to widen the roadway and construct a raised median would increase crossing distance for pedestrians and require ROW for roadway purposes affecting four commercial properties. This is not consistent with proposed Uptown CPU Policy UD-3.35 to support traffic calming by reducing vehicle travel lanes, Policy UD-3.43 which calls for narrowing of streets, and Policy MO-4.9 to implement road diets and traffic calming measures where appropriate to consider community character and safety of all users. Thus, the measure is infeasible and the impact at this location would remain significant and unavoidable. (Infeasibility Category: 2, 3)

Normal Street to Park Boulevard (Impact 6.3-30)

The University Avenue segment from Normal Street to Park Boulevard has a functional classification of a 4 lane collector with no center lane. Installation of a continuous left turn lane would fully

mitigate the impact at this location. Implementation of mitigation measure TRANS 6.3-30 would require roadway widening as there is not currently enough ROW to restripe this segment to the roadway classification needed. Widening of this segment would increase crossing distance for pedestrians and require taking frontage from 9 residential and 2 commercial properties for road purposes. This is not consistent with proposed Uptown CPU Policy UD-3.35 to support traffic calming by reducing vehicle travel lanes, Policy UD-3.43 which calls for narrowing of streets, and Policy MO-4.9 to implement road diets and traffic calming measures where appropriate. Thus, the measure is infeasible and the impact at this location would remain significant and unavoidable. (Infeasibility Category: 2, 3)

Washington Street

Fourth Avenue to Sixth Avenue (Impact 6.3-31)

The Washington Street segment from Fourth Avenue to Sixth Avenue has a functional classification of a 4 lane major arterial. Widening to 6 lane major arterial would fully mitigate the impact at this location. Implementation of mitigation measure TRANS 6.3-31 would increase crossing distance for pedestrians, require bridge widening over 6th Avenue, and impact 6 residential properties. The bridge widening is not included in any public facilities program. In addition, widening is not consistent with Uptown CPU Policy UD-3.35 to support traffic calming by reducing vehicle travel lanes and Policy UD-3.43, which calls for narrowing of streets. Thus, the measure is infeasible and the impact at this location would remain significant and unavoidable. (Infeasibility Category: 2, 3)

Richmond Street Normal Street (Impact 6.3-32)

The functional classification of this roadway segment is 6 lane major arterial. Restriping to a 6 lane prime arterial would fully mitigate the impact at this location. Implementation of mitigation measure TRANS 6.3-32 would require additional ROW that would impact one commercial and three residential properties which is not consistent with Uptown CPU Policy UD-3.35 to support traffic calming by reducing vehicle travel lanes and Policy UD-3.43 which calls for narrowing of streets. Thus, the measure is infeasible and the impact at this location would remain significant and unavoidable. (Infeasibility Category: 2, 3)

2. Noise

Significant Effect

a. Ambient Noise

Section 6.6 of the Final PEIR identifies a significant impact related to increases in ambient noise levels resulting from vehicular traffic associated with continued build-out of the proposed CPU and increases in traffic due to regional growth. Significant ambient noise level increases would occur in the Uptown CPU area and would affect both existing noise sensitive land uses (Impact 6.6-1) and future noise sensitive land uses subject only to a ministerial permit process (Impact 6.6-2).

b. Vehicular Noise

Traffic generated from build-out of the CPU would result in vehicular noise in excess of the applicable land use and noise compatibility levels in certain areas, resulting in a potentially significant exterior noise impact for ministerial projects (Impact 6.6-3).

c. Temporary Construction Noise - Vibration

During build-out of the proposed Uptown CPU, potential pile driving during construction that occurs within 95 feet of existing structures has the potential to exceed 0.20 inch per second peak particle velocity. Thus, potential vibration impacts during future construction activity associated with build-out of the proposed Uptown CPU would be potentially significant (Impact 6.6-5).

Facts in Support of Finding**a. Ambient Noise**

A significant increase in ambient noise would occur adjacent to several street segments in the Uptown CPU area due to future traffic noise that would result in exposure of noise sensitive land uses to noise levels in excess of the compatibility levels established in the General Plan. A significant impact is identified for existing noise sensitive land uses because there is no mitigation framework that can be applied to existing land use to ensure future noise levels are less than significant. Similarly, significant increases in ambient noise could also affect future ministerial projects with noise sensitive land uses because there would be no discretionary review that would allow application of the mitigation framework in the Final PEIR to ministerial projects.

b. Vehicular Noise

A mitigation framework exists for new discretionary development in areas exposed to high levels of vehicle traffic noise. Individual discretionary projects would be required to demonstrate exterior and interior noise levels would be compatible with City standards. However, in the case of ministerial projects, there is no procedure to ensure that exterior noise is adequately attenuated. Ministerial projects are not subject to a discretionary review that would allow site-specific noise evaluation and attenuation for exterior noise impacts. Thus, there is no mechanism to require future ministerial projects to comply with the mitigation framework in the Final PEIR.

c. Temporary Construction Noise - Vibration

The Final PEIR concludes that vibration during construction (primarily resulting from potential pile driving) has the potential to generate perceptible groundborne vibration levels at a range of approximately 100 feet from its source. Mitigation measure Noise 6.6-2 would require a site specific vibration analysis be conducted when construction includes vibration-generating activities such as pile driving and would occur within 95 feet of existing structures. This measure would require a vibration monitoring and contingency plan, monitoring during vibration, and post survey evaluation of structures for potential damage and repairs if damage occurs as a result of construction activities.

Rationale and Conclusion

a. Ambient Noise

The significant impacts related to ambient noise increases (Impacts 6.6-1 and 6.6-2) would remain significant and unavoidable because there is no process in place to require existing land uses and future land uses that only require a ministerial permit to incorporate noise mitigation to attenuate for ambient noise levels in excess of the compatibility levels established in the General Plan Noise Element. Thus, ambient noise impacts to existing noise sensitive land uses (Impacts 6.6-1) and to future noise sensitive land uses subject to a ministerial permit only (Impacts 6.6-2), would be significant and unavoidable. No feasible mitigation has been identified at the program level to reduce these impacts to less than significant as there is no mechanism to require exterior noise analysis and attenuation for these ministerial projects.

b. Vehicular Noise

The Final PEIR identifies significant and unavoidable impacts would occur for future ministerial projects exposed to vehicular traffic noise levels in excess of the compatibility levels established in the General Plan Noise Element, based on future (2035) noise contours (Impact 6.6-3). These impacts would be significant and unavoidable. No feasible mitigation has been identified at the program level to reduce these impacts to less than significant as there is no mechanism to require exterior noise analysis and attenuation for these ministerial projects.

c. Temporary Construction Noise – Vibration

Regarding vibration impacts during construction (Impact 6.6-5), implementation of the mitigation measure NOISE 6.6-2 would reduce construction-related vibration impacts; however, at the program-level it cannot be known whether the measures would be adequate to minimize vibration levels to less than significant. Thus, even with implementation of NOISE 6.6-2, construction related vibration impacts at the program level would be significant and unavoidable.

3. Historical Resources

Significant Effect

a. Historic Structures, Objects, or Sites

Section 6.7 of the Final PEIR identifies a significant impact related to the alteration of a historic building, structure, object, or site where an increase in density is proposed beyond the adopted community plan (Impact 6.7-1).

b. Prehistoric Resources, Sacred Sites, and Human Remains

Section 6.7 of the Final PEIR identifies a significant impact related to the disturbance of prehistoric archeological resources, including religious or sacred use sites and human remains (Impact 6.7-2).

Facts in Support of Finding

a. Historic Structures, Objects, or Sites

The significant impact of the proposed Uptown CPU would be mitigated partially through regulatory compliance, including conformance with the City of San Diego's General Plan, combined with Federal, State, and local regulations, which provide a regulatory framework for project-level historical resources, valuation/analysis criteria, and when applicable, mitigation measures for future discretionary projects. All development projects with the potential to affect historical resources such as designated historical resources; historical buildings, districts, landscapes, objects, and structures are subject to site-specific review in accordance with the City's Historical Resources Regulations and Historical Resources Guidelines, through the subsequent project review process. Mitigation measure HIST-6.7-1 provides a framework that would be required of all development projects with the potential to impact significant historical resources. The framework outlines requirements for avoidance of impacts and minimization of impacts to historic buildings and structures and required measures such as preparation of a historic resource management plan, and screening and shielding to protect the character of historical resources.

b. Prehistoric Resources, Sacred Sites, and Human Remains

All development projects with the potential to affect prehistoric resources such as important archaeological sites; tribal cultural resources, and traditional cultural properties are subject to site-specific review in accordance with the City's Historical Resources Regulations and Historical Resources Guidelines, through the subsequent project review process. Additionally, mitigation measure HIST-6.7-2 provides a framework that would be required of all development projects with the potential to impact significant historical resources. This framework outlines the process of project level reviews conducted by City staff review, requirements for field surveys and archeological testing, archeological monitoring requirements, curation, and required compliance with the City's CEQA Thresholds.

Rationale and Conclusion

a. Historic Structures, Objects, or Sites

Implementation of mitigation measure HIST 6.7-1 combined with the proposed Uptown CPU policies promoting the identification and preservation of historical resources in the Uptown CPU area would reduce the program-level impact related to historical resources of the built environment. However, even with implementation of the mitigation framework, 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.

With respect to potential historic districts, supplemental development regulations would be introduced prior to the adoption of the Uptown CPU; however, the regulations would not be effective until after adoption of the proposed Uptown CPU. Until such time as the potential historic districts are intensively surveyed, verified, and brought forward for designation consistent with City regulations and procedures, impacts to potential historic districts could continue to occur. Implementation of the proposed Uptown CPU and associated discretionary actions would not result in any additional impact to potential historic districts beyond the existing condition, because

additional density is not proposed beyond the adopted community plan in these areas. . Thus, where an increase in density is proposed, potential impacts to historical resources including historic structures, objects, or sites would be significant and unavoidable at the program level.

b. Prehistoric Resources, Sacred Sites, and Human Remains

Implementation of mitigation measure HIST 6.7-2, which addresses archaeological and tribal cultural resources, combined with the policies of the General Plan and the proposed Uptown CPU promote the identification, protection and preservation of archaeological resources; compliance with CEQA and Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1 requiring tribal consultation, and the City's Historical Resources Regulations (SDMC Section 143.0212), which require review of ministerial and discretionary permit applications for any parcel identified as sensitive on the Historical Resources Sensitivity Maps, would reduce the program-level impact related to prehistoric or historical archaeological resources and tribal cultural resources. However, even with application of the existing regulatory framework and mitigation framework, the feasibility and efficacy of mitigation measures cannot be determined at this program level of analysis. Thus, impacts to prehistoric resources, sacred sites, and human remains would be significant and unavoidable at the program level.

4. Paleontological Resources (for ministerial projects only)

Significant Effect

Section 6.10 of the Final PEIR identifies a significant impact related to the potential destruction of paleontological resources. Because of high sensitivity for paleontological resources within the San Diego, Pomerado Conglomerate, and Mission Valley Formations, grading into these formations could potentially destroy fossil resources. Therefore, grading activities associated with the future ministerial projects that require grading in excess of 1,000 cubic yards, extending to a depth of ten feet or greater into high sensitivity formations, could result in significant impacts to paleontological resources.

Facts in Support of Finding

Since ministerial projects are not subject to a discretionary review process, there would be no mechanism to screen for grading quantities and geologic formation sensitivity and apply appropriate requirements for paleontological monitoring. Thus, impacts related to future ministerial development that would occur with build-out of the proposed Uptown CPU and associated discretionary actions would be significant and unavoidable (Impact 6.10-2).

Rationale and Conclusion

Build-out of future ministerial projects in conformance with the proposed Uptown CPU could result in a certain amount of disturbance to the native bedrock within the study area. Since ministerial projects are not subject to a discretionary review process, there would be no mechanism to screen for grading quantities and geologic formation sensitivity and apply appropriate requirements for paleontological monitoring. Thus, impacts resulting from future ministerial development that would occur with build-out of the proposed Uptown CPU and associated discretionary actions would be significant and unavoidable.

D. Findings Regarding Alternatives (CEQA § 21081(a)(3) and CEQA Guidelines §15091(a)(3))

Because the proposed project will cause one or more unavoidable significant environmental effects, the City must make findings with respect to the alternatives to the proposed project considered in the Final PEIR, evaluating whether these alternatives could feasibly avoid or substantially lessen the proposed project's unavoidable significant environmental effects while achieving most of its objectives (listed in Section II.D above and Section 3.3 of the Final PEIR).

The City, having reviewed and considered the information contained in the Final PEIR and the Record of Proceedings, and pursuant to Public Resource Code §21081(a)(3) and State CEQA Guidelines §15091(a)(3), makes the following findings with respect to the alternatives identified in the Final PEIR (Project No. 30330/304032/SCH No. 2004651076): Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations of the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or alternatives identified in the Final PEIR as described below.

"Feasible" is defined in Section 15364 of the CEQA Guidelines to mean "capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, social, and technological factors." The CEQA statute (Section 21081) and Guidelines (Section 15019(a)(3)) also provide that "other" considerations may form the basis for a finding of infeasibility. Case law makes clear that a mitigation measure or alternative can be deemed infeasible on the basis of its failure to meet project objectives or on related public policy grounds.

Background

Five Alternatives to the Uptown CPU were evaluated in Chapter 10 of the Final PEIR:

- No Project (Adopted Community Plan);
- Adopted Community Plan with Removal of the Interim Height Ordinance Alternative;
- Proposed CPU Policies with Adopted Community Plan Land Use Map Alternative;
- Density Redistribution Alternative; and
- Lower-Density Alternative.

These five project Alternatives are summarized below, along with the findings relevant to each Alternative.

No Project (Adopted Community Plan) Alternative

The No Project Alternative is the continued implementation of the adopted Uptown Community Plan for Uptown (1988), consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(3)(A). The No Project Alternative for the Uptown CPU would consist of the adopted Uptown Community Plan land use designations as they apply today, including all amendments to the Uptown Community Plan from its original adoption in 1988 to the most recent amendment in 2008 (as outlined in Table 10-2 of the Final PEIR). The land use plan for the No Project Alternative is shown on Final PEIR Figure 10-1. As shown in Table 10-3 of the Final PEIR, the No Project Alternative could have approximately 34,600 dwelling units at build-out. This would result in 1,900 more units, primarily multi-family, and slightly less institutional and park land uses compared to the proposed Uptown CPU.

The majority of the plan area is designated as Low-Density Residential at 5 to 10 units per acre under the adopted Community Plan. Higher residential density is focused on the major transportation corridors (e.g., Washington Avenue; University Avenue; Park Boulevard; Fourth, Fifth and Sixth avenues) with the highest intensity of up to 110 dwelling units per acre (du/ac) along Fifth and Sixth avenues and within the Hillcrest core. Maximum building heights in these areas would continue to be subject to the Interim Height Ordinance which limits development in Mission Hills and Hillcrest to building heights of 50 and 65 feet, respectively. Mixed-use development is encouraged in selected areas with residential use over street-level retail use.

Potentially Significant Effects

The No Project Alternative consists of continued implementation of the adopted Uptown Community Plan, consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(3)(A). Compared to the proposed Uptown CPU and associated discretionary actions, the No Project Alternative would retain primarily residential land uses. Land use impacts under this Alternative would be similar or greater than the anticipated impacts of the proposed Uptown CPU and associated discretionary actions because it would not contain the proposed CPU policies and land use changes intended to improve compatibility with and implement the San Diego General Plan. Additionally, the No Project Alternative would also not benefit from the proposed Uptown CPU policies that are intended to ensure compatible development and design that enhances and is sensitive to neighborhood character.

Although this Alternative would preserve open space in similar areas as the Uptown CPU, the necessary MHPA boundary line corrections would not be included as part of this Alternative. The boundary line adjustments remove existing developed areas from the MHPA and provide for a more accurate mapping for protection of sensitive habitats within the MHPA. Additionally, this Alternative does not provide the additional parkland and equivalencies to meet the community's need related to park and recreation facilities.

The No Project Alternative allows for more residential units than the proposed Uptown CPU and associated discretionary actions; therefore, this Alternative, therefore, would generate more vehicular trips than the proposed Uptown CPU and result in greater impacts to individual intersections and roadway facilities. The No Project Alternative does not contain additional policies intended to promote a multimodal network that encourage walking, bicycling, and transit and provide a greater level of consistency with General Plan policies. Without increasing multimodal opportunities and providing the same connections to transit and to adjacent communities, this Alternative would also not achieve the same level of consistent with SANDAG 2050 RP or the City's CAP.

Air quality emissions under the No Project Alternative would be slightly greater due to the allowed density in the adopted Uptown Community Plan. Similarly, the No Project Alternative would result in greater impacts than the proposed Uptown CPU and associated discretionary actions relative to greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. The No Project Alternative would result in significant and unmitigated GHG emissions associated with build-out of the plan area as compared to the proposed Uptown CPU and associated discretionary actions. In addition, the No Project Alternative would not change land uses to provide high density and mixed use development within proximity to transit at the same level as the proposed Uptown CPU, and would not implement land use changes and increase multi-modal opportunities consistent with the City of Villages Strategy and the CAP. Thus, at

a Citywide and community level, significant and unavoidable impacts associated with GHG emissions under the No Project Alternative would be slightly greater than the proposed Uptown CPU and associated discretionary actions.

The No Project (Adopted Community Plan) Alternative would not include the identification of potential historic districts and associated policies supporting protection of potential historical resources. Thus, the No Project Alternative would not benefit from the identification of these potential historic districts nor the associated policy framework. Additionally, the No Project Alternative would not benefit from the protections that would be implemented under the proposed Uptown CPU mitigation framework. Under both the No Project Alternative and the proposed Uptown CPU, impacts would be less than significant; however, potential impacts would be slightly reduced under the proposed Uptown CPU.

Finding and Supporting Facts

The No Project Alternative meets several of the eight project objectives, but none to the same extent as the proposed Uptown CPU and associated discretionary actions. The No Project Alternative does not provide the same policy framework relative to the provision of a multi-modal transportation network; and does not provide the same regulatory context for the preservation of historical resources. Furthermore, because the No Project (Adopted Community Plan) Alternative does not include the same provisions for multi-modal facilities or mixed-use development, it would not implement CAP or City of Villages strategies to the same extent as the proposed Uptown CPU and associated discretionary actions. The No Project (Adopted Community Plan) Alternative would also not designate additional park and recreation land uses in combination with policies for additional amenities and equivalencies to address the community's parkland deficit.

While adoption of the No Project (Adopted Community Plan) Alternative would allow future development to proceed in accordance with the adopted Community Plan, adoption of this Alternative would not achieve the following important project objectives:

- Develop a multi-modal transportation network emphasizing active transportation measures for walkable and bicycle-friendly streets, and transit-related measures supporting transit operations and access.
- Identify significant historic and cultural resources within each community and provide for their preservation, protection, and enhancement.

Provide increased recreation opportunities and new public open spaces. Because the No Project (Adopted Community Plan) Alternative would allow more multi-family units, this Alternative would meet the project objective to increase the housing supply along major transit corridors. However, the No Project (Adopted Community Plan) Alternative would not achieve the remaining objectives to the same extent as the proposed Uptown CPU, including the objectives related to walkable and bicycle-friendly streets, increased parks, identification of potential historic districts, or urban design policies.

Rationale and Conclusion

The No Project Alternative is rejected as infeasible because it fails to meet multiple project objectives, and failure to meet even a single objective would be sufficient for rejection of the Alternative and a conclusion that this Alternative is considered infeasible. Further, the No Project Alternative is infeasible because it would not meet the General Plan policy regarding preparation of community plan updates. Specifically, Policy LU-C.1 requires that the update process “establish each community plan as an essential and integral component of the City’s General Plan with clear implementation recommendations and links to General Plan goals and policies.” It further states that community plan updates are important to “maintain consistency between community plans and General Plan, as together they represent the City’s comprehensive plan.” The No Project Alternative would not allow the update to proceed and achieve these General Plan policies.

Adopted Community Plan with Removal of the Height Ordinance Alternative

The Adopted Community Plan with Removal of the Interim Height Ordinance Alternative is similar to the No Project Alternative described above. The majority of plan area is designated as Low-Density Residential with development focused on the major transportation corridors and mixed-use encouraged in selected areas. This Alternative would maintain the adopted land use designations, accommodating 34,600 dwelling units at build-out or 1,900 more units compared to the proposed Uptown CPU. The existing policies in the Uptown Community Plan and zoning program, which includes the Mid-City Communities Plan District and West Lewis Plan District Ordinances, would continue to guide development with the exception of the Interim Height Ordinance (O-20329). With this ordinance removed, the limitation on height of structures in specific areas to 50 and 65 feet would be eliminated.

The Adopted Community Plan with Removal of the Interim Height Ordinance Alternative would allow taller buildings under ministerial review within the Mission Hills, Hillcrest, and Bankers Hill/Park West neighborhoods. Under this Alternative, building heights in areas subject to the Interim Height Ordinance would be regulated by the Mid-City Communities Plan District. In the case of Mission Hills, areas currently limited to 50 feet would allow structures to 150 feet. In the areas of Hillcrest limited to 65 feet, structures would be permitted to 200 feet. The increased building height allowance combined with slightly higher density under this Alternative would allow development with taller buildings compared to the proposed Uptown CPU and associated discretionary actions.

All of the other policies in the Adopted Community Plan with Removal of the Interim Height Ordinance Alternative are the same as the existing policies in the adopted Community Plan.

Potentially Significant Effects

The Adopted Community Plan with Removal of the Interim Height Ordinance Alternative increases residential density above the proposed density under the proposed Uptown CPU and associated discretionary actions. Implementation of the Adopted Community Plan with Removal of the Interim Height Ordinance Alternative would not reduce or avoid any significant impacts of the proposed Uptown CPU and associated discretionary actions and rather, would result in greater impacts relative to land use, neighborhood character, transportation (traffic circulation), air quality, and historic resources. As described below, GHG emissions would also be greater and would be a significant and unavoidable impact.

Land use impacts under this Alternative are due to the lack of policies and land use changes intended to improve compatibility with and implement the San Diego General Plan and the City of Villages as it relates to community plan updates, as well as the SANDAG 2050 RP and the City's CAP.

The Adopted Community Plan with Removal of the Interim Height Ordinance Alternative would have a greater population at build-out than the anticipated population for the build-out of the proposed Uptown CPU and associated discretionary actions. This Alternative would not designate additional parkland within the community to address the parkland deficit from the build-out population. Additionally, this Alternative would not provide MHPA boundary line corrections that would increase sensitive habitat within the MHPA and remove developed land.

The Adopted Community Plan with Removal of the Interim Height Ordinance Alternative would increase the amount of traffic generated, and traffic impacts would be incrementally greater under this Alternative. Likewise, the Adopted Community Plan with Removal of the Interim Height Ordinance Alternative's future operational emissions would be greater than those of the proposed Uptown CPU and associated discretionary actions due to the land use patterns and greater density.

The Adopted Community Plan with Removal of the Interim Height Ordinance Alternative would slightly increase GHG emissions over those of the proposed Uptown CPU and associated discretionary actions. The Adopted Community Plan with Removal of the Interim Height Ordinance Alternative also does not contain additional policies intended to promote a multimodal network that encourage walking, bicycling, and transit and provide a greater level of consistency with the City's General Plan policies, the SANDAG 2050 RP, and the City's CAP. Since the Adopted Community Plan with Removal of the Interim Height Ordinance Alternative would not adjust the land use map or provide policies to implement these strategies, GHG impacts of the Adopted Community Plan with Removal of the Interim Height Ordinance Alternative would be significant and unavoidable and greater than the proposed Uptown CPU and associated discretionary actions.

The Adopted Community Plan with Removal of the Interim Height Ordinance Alternative would not benefit from the amendments to the Historical Resources Regulations in the Land Development Code, because no potential historic districts would be identified and be subject to the regulations. Additionally, this Alternative would allow greater building heights in certain areas. Like the No Project Alternative, the Adopted Community Plan with Removal of the Interim Height Ordinance Alternative would also not provide policies developed to guide design of the community and enhance neighborhood character.

Finding and Supporting Facts

The Adopted Community Plan with Removal of the Interim Height Ordinance Alternative is rejected as infeasible, because it does not meet all of the project objectives, and failure to meet even a single objective would be sufficient for rejection of the Alternative and a conclusion of infeasibility. The Adopted Community Plan with Removal of the Interim Height Ordinance Alternative does not meet the objective of designating increased recreation opportunities in the land use plan and does not meet the objective of preserving neighborhood character and design relationships between neighborhoods within each community through the development of transitions and design policies. The existing policy framework, in combination with greater total build-out potential within the CPU area, would result in incrementally greater impacts associated with neighborhood character, traffic and circulation, air quality, and historical resources than under the proposed Uptown CPU and

associated discretionary actions. Furthermore, it would not avoid any of the significant unavoidable impacts of the proposed Uptown CPU and associated discretionary actions (traffic circulation, noise, historical resources, and paleontological resources). Similar to the proposed Uptown CPU and associated discretionary actions, programmatic mitigation included in the Final PEIR would be implemented through future discretionary projects to reduce potential impacts associated with paleontological resources and noise to below a level of significance.

Rationale and Conclusion

The Adopted Community Plan with Removal of the Interim Height Ordinance Alternative is rejected as infeasible because this Alternative would not meet all of the project objectives, would not reduce any of the significant effects of the project, and would result in incrementally greater impacts without offering sufficient benefits to offset the increased level of impact.

Proposed CPU Policies with Adopted Community Plan Land Use Map Alternative

The Proposed CPU Policies with Adopted Community Plan Land Use Map Alternative would use the adopted Uptown Community Plan land use map. The Alternative would address neighborhood character issues by implementing the new proposed urban design policies that address objectives such as creating development transitions between new development and existing neighborhoods, increasing the urban tree canopy, and supporting sustainable development. Under this Alternative, the current zoning program which includes the Mid-City Communities Plan District and the West Lewis Plan District ordinances would be retained with the exception of the Interim Height Ordinance (O-20329), which would be repealed. Under the proposed project, a Land Development Code Amendment would amend the CPIOZ to reduce heights in areas of Mission Hills and Hillcrest. These amendments would not be included in the Proposed CPU Policies with the Adopted Community Plan Land Use Map Alternative.

The build-out assumptions and land use map would be identical to the No Project (Adopted Community Plan) Alternative, which would allow increased residential multi-family dwelling units. Like the proposed Uptown CPU, this Alternative would identify potential historic districts and an associated policy framework that addresses preservation of potential historic districts. Application of the proposed Uptown CPU policies related to urban design and mobility under this Alternative would also provide design guidance including development transitions to new development and would support multimodal transportation choices.

Potentially Significant Effects

The Proposed CPU Policies with Adopted Community Plan Land Use Map Alternative would retain the adopted Community Plan land uses, would apply proposed CPU policies, and apply a zoning program including the Mid-City Communities Plan District, the West Lewis Plan District and would retain the Interim Height Ordinance (O-20329). Application of the proposed CPU policies under this Alternative would ensure consistency with the City's General Plan City of Villages Strategy, the City's CAP policies, and other applicable land use plans and policies. Implementation of this Alternative, however, would not reduce or avoid any significant impacts of the proposed Uptown CPU and associated discretionary actions and rather, would result in greater impacts relative to transportation (traffic circulation), air quality, and GHG emissions.

The Proposed CPU Policies with Adopted Community Plan Land Use Map Alternative would increase the development potential and the amount of traffic generated. Therefore, vehicle trips along with impacts to individual intersections and roadway segments would be greater under this Alternative. This Alternative would incorporate policies that would support the goal of creating a multi-modal transportation network; thus, potential impacts related to alternative transportation would be similar to the proposed Uptown CPU.

With the development potential and increased vehicle trips, the Proposed CPU Policies with Adopted Community Plan Land Use Map Alternative's future operational emissions would be slightly greater than those of the proposed Uptown CPU and associated discretionary actions.

The Proposed CPU Policies with Adopted Community Plan Land Use Map Alternative would slightly increase GHG emissions over those of the proposed Uptown CPU. Since the Proposed CPU Policies with Adopted Community Plan Land Use Map Alternative would not adjust the land use map, but would include the proposed CPU policies to implement associated CAP strategies, GHG impacts of this Alternative would be less than significant, but would be greater than the proposed Uptown CPU.

Finding and Supporting Facts

The Proposed CPU Policies with Adopted Community Plan Land Use Map Alternative meets seven of the eight project objectives. Because this Alternative does not change the land use map, it would not provide for increased recreation opportunities in the CPU area. Additional population associated with build-out under this Alternative would also result in a potentially greater parkland deficit than under the proposed Uptown CPU and associated discretionary actions. However, this Alternative does include policies similar to the proposed Uptown CPU and associated discretionary actions. The Proposed CPU Policies with Adopted Community Plan Land Use Map Alternative promotes a multi-modal network, preserves neighborhood character and design relationships, and meets the objective to protect significant historic and cultural resources. However, because the Adopted Community Plan Land Use Map Alternative would retain adopted land uses, this Alternative would not provide for increased recreation opportunities within the Uptown community.

With no land use changes, the Proposed CPU Policies with Adopted Community Plan Land Use Map Alternative would allow increase intensity of development and greater total build-out potential within the CPU area. This Alternative would result in incrementally greater impacts associated with traffic and circulation, air quality, and GHG emissions than under the proposed Uptown CPU and associated discretionary actions. Furthermore, it would not avoid any of the significant unavoidable impacts of the proposed Uptown CPU and associated discretionary actions (traffic, noise, historical resources, and paleontological resources). Similar to the proposed Uptown CPU and associated discretionary actions, programmatic mitigation included in the Final PEIR would be implemented through future discretionary projects to reduce potential impacts associated with paleontological resources and noise to below a level of significance.

Rationale and Conclusion

The Proposed CPU Policies with Adopted Community Plan Land Use Map Alternative would not meet all of the project objectives. This Alternative does not change the land use map and thus, it would not provide for increased recreation opportunities in the CPU area. The Proposed CPU Policies with Adopted Community Plan Land Use Map Alternative is rejected as infeasible because this Alternative

would not reduce any of the significant effects of the project and would result in incrementally greater impacts with regard to air quality, traffic, and GHG emissions without offering sufficient benefits to offset the increased level of impact.

Density Redistribution Alternative

The Density Redistribution Alternative applies land uses proposed in June 2015 Draft Community Plan and includes all the other discretionary actions and proposed policies in the proposed Uptown CPU without the corresponding density bonus incentives. Without the density bonus incentives along select portions of transit corridors, the build-out of this Alternative would be similar to the proposed Uptown CPU. Under the Density Redistribution Alternative, the reduction in density would be redistributed within the CPU area resulting in the same overall development potential as the proposed Uptown CPU. To accomplish this, there are a few areas where the Density Redistribution Alternative includes higher density than the proposed Uptown CPU. Figure 10-4 in the Final PEIR shows the proposed Density Redistribution Alternative land use map. The Normal Street corner lot along Park Boulevard is reduced to Community Commercial 0-44 du/ac. The Density Redistribution Alternative increases transit corridor density along Park Boulevard between University Avenue and Washington Street and Normal Street from 73 du/ac to 109 and 145 du/ac.

The Density Redistribution Alternative proposes density decreases in nine specific locations. When compared to the proposed Uptown CPU, the Density Redistribution Alternative reduces residential density development potential along India Street, Reynard Way, the 4th Avenue Commercial Office areas, and Bankers Hills/Park West Neighborhood from 44 du/ac to 29 du/ac. The Density Redistribution Alternative also reduces areas of the Medical Center Complex, Washington Street near Dove Street, and areas within Central Hillcrest from 73 du/ac to 44 du/ac. Finally, the core Central Hillcrest area is reduced from 109 du/ac to 44 du/ac and Hillcrest South of Pennsylvania is reduced from 109 du/ac to 74 du/ac.

Potentially Significant Effects

The Density Redistribution Alternative changes and redistributes the residential density along certain corridors above compared to what is proposed under the proposed Uptown CPU and associated discretionary actions. The Density Redistribution Alternative would lower density throughout the community with the exception of the Park Boulevard transit corridor between Washington Street, University Avenue, and Normal Street. Land use impacts under this Alternative would be similar to the anticipated impacts to the proposed Uptown CPU. The proposed land uses would be compatible with the implementation of the San Diego General Plan, but to a lesser degree. Like the proposed Uptown CPU, this Alternative would not conflict with adopted land use plans, policies, or ordinances; however it would achieve consistency with the General Plan City of Villages strategy to a lesser extent. Specifically, the Density Redistribution Alternative would facilitate transit-oriented development and mixed use development but to a lesser degree than the proposed Uptown CPU due to reduced density near areas accessible to transit with the exception of the Park Boulevard transit corridor. Thus, land use impacts of this Alternative would be slightly greater than the proposed Uptown CPU.

As a result of implementation of the Density Redistribution Alternative, there would be fewer vehicle trips, and operation of the intersections and roadway segments would result in fewer impacts to the vehicle network. With the decrease in vehicle trips, air quality emissions would also be reduced.

However, the GHG efficiencies in locating increased development in close proximity to transit would not occur. Because of lower density along most transit commercial nodes, this Alternative would not achieve the same level of consistency with applicable plans, including alternative transportation strategies. Although this Alternative would have less impact on traffic and circulation and air quality, it would not avoid any significant impacts of the proposed Uptown CPU and associated discretionary actions and rather, would result in greater impacts relative to land use plans and GHG. This would result in a potential conflict with the implementation of CAP Strategies and the General Plan's City of Villages strategy. Decreasing residential and commercial density in transit corridors and Community Villages within a Transit Priority Area (TPA) would not support the City of San Diego in achieving the GHG emissions reduction targets of the CAP since these residents would need to find housing or employment elsewhere that may not have accessibility to transit.

Finding and Supporting Facts

The Density Redistribution Alternative meets all of the eight project objectives, similar to the proposed Uptown CPU and associated discretionary actions. However, due to the decreased intensity of development along transit corridors, with the exception of Park Boulevard, this Alternative would result in incrementally greater impacts associated with land use and GHG emissions and a potential conflict with the City's goals to implement the CAP Strategies and the General Plan's City of Villages strategy. Furthermore, it would not avoid any of the significant unavoidable impacts of the proposed Uptown CPU and associated discretionary actions (traffic, noise, historical resources, and paleontological resources). Similar to the proposed Uptown CPU and associated discretionary actions, programmatic mitigation included in the Final PEIR would be implemented through future discretionary projects to reduce potential impacts associated with paleontological resources and noise to below a level of significance.

Rationale and Conclusion

While the Density Redistribution Alternative would meet all of the eight project objectives, it is rejected as infeasible because this it would not reduce any of the significant effects of the project and would result in incrementally greater impacts with regard to with land use and GHG without offering sufficient benefits to offset the increased level of impact.

Lower-Density Alternative

The Lower-Density Alternative incorporates the land uses proposed in June 2015 Draft Community Plan without the corresponding density bonus incentives originally proposed with this land use scenario. The Lower-Density Alternative would accommodate a slightly reduced population of 31,100 in the CPU area. The total projected population under the Lower-Density Alternative would be 2,650 persons less than under the proposed Uptown CPU and associated discretionary actions. The Lower-Density Alternative would be the same as the Density Redistribution Alternative with the exception that density would not increase along the Park Boulevard generally between Washington Street, University Avenue, and Normal Street. The Lower-Density Alternative would reduce multi-family development potential and result in a slight increase in single family development potential.

Potentially Significant Effects

The Lower-Density Alternative would retain the proposed Uptown CPU land uses, but would lower multi-family density throughout the community along transit corridors and nodes. Land use impacts under this Alternative would be similar to the anticipated impacts to the proposed Uptown CPU. The Lower-Density Alternative would facilitate transit-oriented development and mixed use development, but to a lesser degree than the proposed Uptown CPU due to reduced density near areas within proximity to transit. Land use changes would be compatible with the implementation of the General Plan, but to a lesser degree due to reduced consistency with applicable land use plans.

Implementation of this Alternative would result in fewer trips than would be generated by the proposed Uptown CPU and associated discretionary actions; however, impacts related to traffic circulation would be similar to the proposed Uptown CPU and in the case of alternative transportation would be greater. Although there would be less trips generated, this Alternative would also result in significant and unavoidable impacts to roadway segments and intersections, and impacts would likely be similar to the proposed Uptown CPU. The Lower-Density Alternative would contain the proposed Uptown CPU policies intended to promote a multimodal network that encourage walking, bicycling, and taking transit; however, these goals would be achieved to a lesser extent due to the reductions in development potential within areas accessible to transit. Thus, alternative transportation impacts of the Lower-Density Alternative would be slightly greater than the proposed Uptown CPU.

Potential decreases in traffic and development potential which have the potential to decrease air quality emissions could be cancelled out by the fact less density in close proximity and accessible to transit. Thus, air quality impacts under this Alternative would likely be similar to the proposed Uptown CPU. In addition, the GHG efficiencies of providing fewer multi-family units and development in proximity to transit would be lost. This would result in a potential conflict with the implementation of CAP Strategies and the General Plan's City of Villages Strategy. Decreasing residential and commercial density in transit corridors and Community Villages within a TPA would not support the City of San Diego in achieving the GHG emissions reduction targets of the CAP since these residents would need to find housing or employment elsewhere that may not have accessibility to transit.

Finding and Supporting Facts

The Lower-Density Alternative meets seven of the eight project objectives. The Lower-Density Alternative would not meet the objective to maintain or increase the housing supply with higher residential densities along major transit corridors. This Alternative does not provide the same extent or density of housing as proposed under the proposed Uptown CPU and associated discretionary actions, especially within transit corridors; therefore, it would not facilitate economic development through the creation of new mixed-use opportunities with greater residential intensities within the central business core of the community to the same degree as the proposed Uptown CPU and associated discretionary actions. Furthermore, this Alternative would not avoid any of the significant unavoidable impacts of the proposed Uptown CPU and associated discretionary actions (traffic, noise, historical resources, and paleontological resources). Similar to the proposed Uptown CPU and associated discretionary actions, programmatic mitigation included in the Final PEIR would be implemented through future discretionary projects to reduce potential impacts associated with paleontological resources and noise to below a level of significance.

Rationale and Conclusion

This Alternative is rejected as infeasible because it does not meet the project objectives to the same extent as the proposed Uptown CPU and associated discretionary actions and would not implement CAP Strategies and the General Plan City of Villages Strategy to the same degree as the project. This Alternative would have slightly less impacts related to traffic and air quality; however those reduced impacts would not outweigh the greater impacts of this Alternative with regard to CAP consistency.