

# CHAPTER 6.0

## ALTERNATIVES

---

CEQA requires a PEIR to describe and evaluate a range of reasonable alternatives to a proposed project, or alternatives to the location of a proposed project. The purpose of the alternatives analysis is to explore ways that most of the basic objectives of the DVSP Update could be attained while reducing or avoiding significant environmental impacts of the project as proposed. This approach is intended to foster informed decision-making and public participation in the environmental process.

This chapter evaluates alternatives to the DVSP Update and examines the potential environmental impacts associated with each alternative. EIRs must evaluate a “...range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which could feasibly attain the basic objectives of the project” (Section 15126.6[a] State CEQA Guidelines). Not every conceivable alternative must be addressed, nor do infeasible alternatives need be considered. When addressing feasibility, Section 15126.6 of the State CEQA Guidelines states that the factors that may be taken into account when addressing the feasibility of alternatives are site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, other plans or regulatory limitations, and jurisdictional boundaries. The Guidelines also state that the discussion of alternatives should focus on “...alternatives capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant effects of the project, even if these alternatives could impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives or would be more costly” (Section 15166.6[b] State CEQA Guidelines). CEQA further directs that “...the significant effects of the alternatives shall be discussed, but in less detail than the significant effects of the project as proposed” (Section 15126.6[d] State CEQA Guidelines).

The following sections discuss the DVSP Update alternatives that were considered pursuant to CEQA. Based on the State CEQA Guidelines, the following alternatives to avoid or reduce significant impacts were identified and are discussed in Section 6.3: the No Project Alternative, the Reduced Project Alternative, and the Expanded Street Configuration Alternative. Additionally, two alternatives are identified in Section 6.2 that were considered but ultimately rejected: the Escondido Avenue Corridor Alternative and the Increased Density Alternative.

### 6.1 PROJECT OBJECTIVES

As stated in Section 3.3 of this PEIR, the fundamental objectives of the DVSP Update are to:

**Objective 1:** Develop four distinct planning areas within the SPA, each of which provides specific types of development opportunities based on community need, existing uses, and location within the SPA. The planning areas will include a gateway mixed use

district, civic and entertainment district, mercantile and retail district and larger scale retail district.

- Objective 2:** Identify design and development guidelines for each of the four planning areas and the entire SPA that address the following: permitted uses, prohibited uses, operating standards, fences and walls, landscaping, parking and loading, lighting, signs, standards for specific land uses, lighting and security, building design, architectural design, and circulation and access.
- Objective 3:** Provide new mixed-use commercial and residential development opportunities in the SPA, including up to 1,270 new dwelling units and 1.8 million SF of commercial retail and office uses.
- Objective 4:** Identify landscape design guidelines for the SPA to improve the aesthetic environment of the downtown area and create a cohesive community design plan.
- Objective 5:** Improve traffic circulation within the SPA, including improvements to the following intersections: Olive Avenue and N. Melrose Drive; S. Santa Fe Avenue and E. Broadway; S. Santa Fe Avenue and Pala Vista Drive; S. Santa Fe Avenue and Guajome Street; S. Santa Fe Avenue and Escondido Avenue; Vale Terrace and E. Vista Way; and Escondido Avenue and Eucalyptus Avenue.
- Objective 6:** Provide water, sewer and storm drain infrastructure improvements in the SPA to serve the proposed commercial and residential uses.
- Objective 7:** Preserve the historic downtown area of Vista by creating a Character Overlay Zone and requiring architectural design styles and construction methods and materials that are compatible with the surrounding area.
- Objective 8:** Increase the use of alternative transportation within the SPA by providing improved pedestrian, bicycle and transit facilities and corridors that are easily accessible to the public.
- Objective 9:** Provide residential housing for a variety of income levels and housing needs by offering various housing types including live/work units, single-family dwellings, multiple-family dwellings, and senior housing developments.
- Objective 10:** Increase public safety by clearly delineating pedestrian circulation through landscaping, walkways, and decorative hardscape as well as creating pedestrian pathways between parking areas and businesses.
- Objective 11:** Promote sustainable development principles by encouraging high-density commercial development near the core of the district, connected to residential development with pedestrian corridors.
- Objective 12:** Create an 18-hour activity area at the core of the SPA, featuring a variety of residential development and large anchor retail with increased building heights and building density.

## **6.2 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT REJECTED**

### **6.2.1 ESCONDIDO AVENUE CORRIDOR ALTERNATIVE**

The Escondido Avenue Corridor Alternative would add the segment of Escondido Avenue from Eucalyptus Avenue to S. Santa Fe Avenue to the SPA. The corridor would include the areas immediately adjacent to both sides of Escondido Avenue, which are currently developed with mostly commercial uses. This corridor was considered as a possible location for additional mixed-use redevelopment in the City. However, this alternative was ultimately rejected because the narrow width of the Escondido Avenue corridor would not provide adequate development area to support mixed-use development that would allow persons to live, work and shop in their immediate neighborhood. The corridor is also physically separated from the rest of the downtown area by residential development and is not located in close proximity to either Sprinter station in the SPA. According to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6, an EIR shall describe a range of alternatives that meet most of the basic objectives of the proposed project, but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the proposed project. This alternative would not avoid any of the significant impacts that would potentially result from implementation of the proposed DVSP Update, and would likely result in additional impacts to air quality, climate change, cultural resources, noise, public services, traffic, and utilities. This alternative would not meet Objective 1 of the DVSP Update because it would not be located or have uses that fit within one of the four distinct planning areas or Objective 3 because it would not provide opportunities for successful mixed-use development. Therefore, this alternative was rejected from further analysis.

### **6.2.2 INCREASED RESIDENTIAL DENSITY ALTERNATIVE**

The Increased Residential Density Alternative would increase the development density allowed in PA-3 and PA-4. As identified in the DVSP Update, the proposed vision for PA-3 is primarily a retail district, while the proposed vision for PA-4 is to allow large anchor retail that will attract local and regional visitors. Under the Increased Residential Density Alternative, PA-3 and PA-4 would both allow additional housing units to be constructed so the SPA would accommodate more of the City's housing allotment as identified in the RHNA. This would be accomplished through the construction of high mid-rise buildings (up to eight stories), rather than the low mid-rise buildings (up to four stories) that are proposed under the DVSP Update. The increased residential development would change the intended vision and function of these two planning areas, and the SPA overall. This alternative was rejected from further evaluation because eight story buildings would not be compatible with the single-family residential areas that surround the SPA, the historic downtown area, or the less intensive development proposed for PA-1 and PA-2 (up to four stories). This alternative would not meet Objectives 1 or 2, which propose the development of four distinct planning areas within the SPA, each of which provides specific types of development opportunities. This alternative would also not comply with the design and development guidelines identified for PA-3 and PA-4 (Objective 3) and would be in conflict with preserving the historic downtown area (Objective 7). State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6 states that an EIR shall describe a range of alternatives that meet most of the basic objectives of the proposed project, but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the proposed project. Increasing the development intensity in PA-3 and PA-4 would result in additional impacts to aesthetics, air quality, climate change, noise, public services, traffic, and utilities. Therefore, this alternative was rejected from further analysis.

## 6.3 ALTERNATIVES ANALYZED

This section presents an evaluation of three alternatives to the DVSP Update: 1) No Project Alternative; 2) Reduced Project Alternative; and 3) Expanded Street Configuration Alternative. For each alternative, a brief description is provided, followed by a summary impact analysis relative to the proposed DVSP Update, and an assessment of the degree to which the alternative would meet the DVSP Update goals. Table 6-1 provides a comparison of the significant direct impacts for the DVSP Update and alternatives. Table 6-2 provides a summary of the selected alternatives' abilities to meet the DVSP Update goals.

### 6.3.1 NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

CEQA requires the No Project Alternative to be addressed in an EIR. Under the No Project Alternative, it is assumed that the DVSP Update would not be adopted and the existing SP #26 would be the applicable planning document for the downtown area. The Vista General Plan would remain the applicable planning document for areas outside of the existing SP #26 boundary included in the proposed SPA. Development and redevelopment would continue to occur in the proposed SPA boundary under SP #26 and the City General Plan; however, the DVSP Update is anticipated to include a higher intensity of development in the SPA compared to this alternative by accommodating greater mixed use commercial and residential development. Additionally, the No Project Alternative would not adopt the design and development guidelines of the DVSP Update and would not construct the proposed public services and roadway improvements discussed therein.

#### 6.3.1.1 Impact Analysis

##### Aesthetics

The No Project Alternative would not result in significant impacts to any designated scenic vistas within the SPA. Therefore, impacts to scenic vistas would be less than significant, similar to the DVSP Update. Unlike the proposed project, the No Project Alternative would not implement the design and development guidelines that would enhance the visual character and quality of the downtown area. While future development in the downtown area under the existing SP #26 would be consistent with existing development, when compared to the proposed project, which would substantially enhance the visual character of the downtown area, the No Project Alternative would result in increased impacts to visual character and quality. Less than significant impacts associated with lighting and glare would be slightly reduced under the No Project Alternative because the intensity of development and redevelopment under the No Project Alternative would be less than under the DVSP Update.

##### Air Quality

The No Project Alternative would be consistent with the applicable air quality plan because build-out of SP #26 was included in the population assumptions made by SANDAG and utilized in the air quality plan. Additionally, implementation of the No Project Alternative would not accommodate land uses typically associated with the production of objectionable odors. Therefore, similar to the DVSP Update, the No Project Alternative would result in less than significant impacts to these issues. Compared to the DVSP Update, the No Project Alternative would result in reduced impacts in terms of consistency with air quality standards because build-out of the SPA under this alternative would be less intensive than build-out under the DVSP Update. However, unlike the proposed project, the No Project Alternative does not propose transit-oriented development, which would result in reduced vehicle miles traveled and associated pollutant emissions. Therefore, construction and some operational emissions would be reduced under this alternative as compared to the DVSP Update; however, vehicular emissions may be

**Table 6-1. Summary of Analysis for Alternatives to the DVSP Update**

| Issue Areas with Potential for Increased or Decreased Impacts as Compared to the DVSP Update                            | DVSP Update        |                 | Alternatives to the DVSP Update |                 |                               |
|---|--------------------|-----------------|---------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|
|   | Without Mitigation | With Mitigation | No Project                      | Reduced Project | Expanded Street Configuration |
| <b>4.1 Aesthetics</b>   |                    |                 |                                 |                 |                               |
| Scenic Vistas,  | LS                 | LS              | —                               | —               | —                             |
| Visual Character or Quality   | LS                 | LS              | ▲                               | ▲               | —                             |
| Light or Glare  | LS                 | LS              | ▼                               | ▼               | —                             |
| <b>4.2 Air Quality</b>  |                    |                 |                                 |                 |                               |
| Consistency with the RAQS   | LS                 | LS              | —                               | —               | —                             |
| Consistency with Air Quality Standards  | PS                 | SU              | ▼                               | ▼               | —                             |
| Sensitive Receptors   | PS                 | LS              | —                               | —               | —                             |
| Odors   | LS                 | LS              | —                               | —               | —                             |
| <b>4.3 Biological Resources</b>   |                    |                 |                                 |                 |                               |
| Impacts to Sensitive Species, Riparian or Other Sensitive Habitats, Federally Protected Wetlands, and Migratory Species | PS                 | LS              | —                               | —               | —                             |
| Impacts to Adopted Policies and Plans   | LS                 | LS              | —                               | —               | —                             |
| <b>4.4 Climate Change</b>   |                    |                 |                                 |                 |                               |
| Direct and Indirect Generation of GHG   | LS                 | LS              | ▲                               | —               | —                             |
| <b>4.5 Cultural Resources</b>   |                    |                 |                                 |                 |                               |
| Paleontological Resources   | LS                 | LS              | —                               | —               | —                             |
| Archaeological Resources and Human Remains  | PS                 | LS              | —                               | —               | —                             |
| Historical Resources  | PS                 | SU              | —                               | —               | —                             |
| <b>4.6 Geology and Soils</b>  |                    |                 |                                 |                 |                               |
| Geologic Hazards  | LS                 | LS              | —                               | —               | —                             |
| Unstable Soils  | LS                 | LS              | —                               | —               | —                             |
| Soil Erosion or Loss of Topsoil   | LS                 | LS              | —                               | —               | —                             |
| Expansive Soil  | LS                 | LS              | —                               | —               | —                             |
| <b>4.7 Hazardous Materials</b>  |                    |                 |                                 |                 |                               |
| Hazards to the Public of the Environment  | PS                 | LS              | —                               | —               | —                             |
| Hazards to Nearby Schools   | LS                 | LS              | —                               | —               | —                             |
| Emergency Response and Evacuation   | PS                 | LS              | —                               | —               | —                             |
| <b>4.8 Hydrology and Water Quality</b>  |                    |                 |                                 |                 |                               |
| Site Drainage and Hydrology   | LS                 | LS              | —                               | —               | —                             |
| Water Quality   | LS                 | LS              | —                               | —               | —                             |
| Flood Hazard Area   | PS                 | LS              | ▲                               | ▲               | —                             |
| Levee, Dam Failure, or Seiche Hazard Area   | LS                 | LS              | —                               | —               | —                             |
| Groundwater Supply and Recharge   | LS                 | LS              | —                               | —               | —                             |
| <b>4.9 Land Use and Planning</b>  |                    |                 |                                 |                 |                               |
| Land Use Plan, Policy, and Regulation Consistency   | PS                 | SU              | —                               | —               | ▼                             |
| Physically Divide an Established Community  | LS                 | LS              | —                               | —               | —                             |
| Conflict with Existing Land Uses  | LS                 | LS              | —                               | —               | —                             |

**Table 6-1. Continued**

| Issue Areas with Potential for Increased or Decreased Impacts as Compared to the DVSP Update                         | DVSP Update        |                 | Alternatives to the DVSP Update |                 |                               |
|--|--------------------|-----------------|---------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|
|  | Without Mitigation | With Mitigation | No Project                      | Reduced Project | Expanded Street Configuration |
| <b>4.10 Noise</b>  |                    |                 |                                 |                 |                               |
| Local Noise Standards, Ambient Noise Levels, Temporary Noise Increases, and Airport Noise                            | PS                 | LS              | —                               | —               | —                             |
| Groundborne Vibration  | PS                 | LS              | —                               | —               | —                             |
| <b>4.11 Population and Housing</b>   |                    |                 |                                 |                 |                               |
| Direct or Indirect Inducement of Substantial Population Growth   | LS                 | LS              | —                               | —               | —                             |
| Displacement of Housing and/or People  | LS                 | LS              | —                               | —               | —                             |
| <b>4.12 Public Services</b>  |                    |                 |                                 |                 |                               |
| Police Protection  | PS                 | LS              | —                               | —               | —                             |
| Fire Protection  | LS                 | LS              | —                               | —               | —                             |
| Public Schools   | PS                 | LS              | —                               | —               | —                             |
| <b>4.13 Recreation</b>   |                    |                 |                                 |                 |                               |
| Impacts to Existing Recreational Facilities  | LS                 | LS              | ▲                               | —               | ▲                             |
| Adverse Effects from Recreational Facilities   | PS                 | LS              | ▼                               | ▼               | ▼                             |
| <b>4.14 Traffic</b>  |                    |                 |                                 |                 |                               |
| Increases in Traffic, Exceedance of LOS Standards, and Increases in Vehicle Trips, Roadway Volume and Miles Traveled | PS                 | SU              | —                               | ▼               | ▼                             |
| Increases in Hazards   | LS                 | LS              | ▼                               | —               | —                             |
| Emergency Access   | PS                 | LS              | —                               | —               | —                             |
| Parking Capacity   | LS                 | LS              | —                               | —               | —                             |
| Alternative Transportation   | LS                 | LS              | —                               | —               | ▲                             |
| <b>4.15 Utilities</b>  |                    |                 |                                 |                 |                               |
| Water Supply and Infrastructure  | PS                 | LS              | ▲                               | —               | —                             |
| Wastewater Treatment Requirements, Infrastructure, and Capacity  | PS                 | LS              | —                               | —               | —                             |
| Stormwater Facilities  | PS                 | LS              | ▲                               | ▲               | —                             |
| Natural Gas, Electricity, and Telecommunications Facilities  | LS                 | LS              | —                               | —               | —                             |
| Solid Waste Disposal   | LS                 | LS              | —                               | —               | —                             |

- ▲ Alternative is likely to result in greater impacts to issue when compared to DVSP Update
  - Alternative is likely to result in a similar impacts to issue when compared to DVSP Update
  - ▼ Alternative is likely to result in less impacts to issue when compared to DVSP Update
- PS = Potentially significant impact; LS = Less than significant impact; SU = Potentially significant and unavoidable impact

**Table 6-2. Ability of Alternatives to Meet DVSP Update Goals**

| DVSP Update Goals  | Ability of Alternatives to Meet DVSP Update Goals |                 |                               |
|--|---|-----------------|-------------------------------|
|  | No Project  | Reduced Project | Expanded Street Configuration |
| Objective 1: Develop four distinct planning areas  | No  | Partial         | Yes                           |
| Objective 2: Identify design and development guidelines for each of the four planning areas and the entire SPA | No  | Yes             | Yes                           |
| Objective 3: Provide new mixed use commercial and residential development opportunities                        | Partial   | Partial         | Yes                           |
| Objective 4: Identify landscape design guidelines  | Yes   | Yes             | Yes                           |
| Objective 5: Improve traffic circulation within the SPA  | No  | Partial         | Yes                           |
| Objective 6: Provide water, sewer and storm drain infrastructure improvements                                  | No  | Partial         | Yes                           |
| Objective 7: Preserve the historic downtown area of Vista  | No  | Yes             | Yes                           |
| Objective 8: Increase the use of alternative transportation  | No  | Partial         | Partial                       |
| Objective 9: Provide residential housing for a variety of income levels and housing needs                      | Partial   | Yes             | Yes                           |
| Objective 10: Increase public safety by clearly delineating pedestrian circulation                             | No  | Yes             | Partial                       |
| Objective 11: Promote sustainable development principles   | No  | Yes             | Yes                           |
| Objective 12: Create an 18-hour activity area at the core of the SPA   | No  | No              | Yes                           |

the same due to the offsets from transit-oriented development. Overall, fewer construction and operational criteria air pollutant emissions would be expected as compared to the DVSP Update. However, impacts would still be anticipated to be significant under this alternative and require mitigation measures similar to those proposed in Section 4.2, Air Quality. The No Project Alternative would accommodate residential and commercial development with the potential to expose sensitive receptors to TACs from nearby gas stations or dry cleaners; however, the mitigation proposed for the DVSP Update would also reduce impacts associated with this alternative to below a significant level.

### Biological Resources

Similar to implementation of the DVSP Update, future development under the No Project Alternative would have the potential to directly impact sensitive Diego coastal sage scrub and exotic riparian woodland habitats located within the plan boundary and the sensitive species supported by these habitats, including migratory species. Additionally, future development adjacent to Buena Vista Creek or its tributaries would have the potential to result in a significant impact to a jurisdictional waterway, similar to the proposed project. The mitigation identified in Section 4.3, Biological Resources, would also be required to reduce impacts to a less than significant level under the No Project Alternative. Implementation of this alternative would not conflict with adopted plans, policies, and regulations because the project area is not identified for conservation as a BCRA or FPA in the North County MSCP. Additionally, future development would be required to conform to the NCCP Guidelines. Therefore, implementation of the No Project Alternative would not conflict with the North County MHCP or NCCP, similar to the DVSP Update.

## **Climate Change**

The No Project Alternative would support a less intensive build-out of uses in the SPA area compared to the DVSP Update; however, the sustainability guidelines that would be implemented under the DVSP Update would not be implemented under this alternative. These guidelines would reduce GHG emissions associated with implementation of the DVSP Update by 35 percent compared to BAU. Development under the No Project Alternative would be BAU. Therefore, compared to the DVSP Update, the No Project Alternative would result in greater GHG emissions from vehicular sources, energy consumption, water use, solid waste disposal, and construction activities. This alternative would result in a greater impact to climate change as compared to the DVSP Update. Because no measures to reduce GHG emissions below BAU levels would be implemented under the No Project Alternative, this impact would be significant and mitigation would be required.

## **Cultural Resources**

Similar to the DVSP Update, the No Project Alternative would involve demolition/remodeling of potentially significant historical resources in the SPA and would also have the potential to impact significant archaeological resources in currently undeveloped areas during ground disturbing construction activities. Therefore, implementation of the No Project Alternative would result in a similar potentially significant impact as is identified for the DVSP Update and the mitigation measures identified in Section 4.5, Cultural Resources, would be required to reduce impacts to below a significant level. The discovery of human remains would comply with applicable State law and, therefore, be less than significant, similar to the DVSP Update. Similar to the DVSP Update, impacts to paleontological resources would be less than significant because the underlying soils have low potential to contain paleontological resources.

## **Geology and Soils**

The No Project Alternative would result in similar less than significant impacts as the DVSP Update for geologic hazards, unstable soils, and expansive soils because compliance with IBC and CBC standards and implementation of site-specific geotechnical investigation recommendations required under the Grading and Erosion Control Ordinance would ensure that impacts associated with landslides, unstable soils, expansive soil, would be less than significant. Implementation of BMPs required by the City's Stormwater Standards Manual would ensure that impacts associated with soil erosion are less than significant, similar to the DVSP Update.

## **Hazards/Hazardous Materials**

Similar to the DVSP Update, the No Project Alternative would result in potentially significant impacts with regard to: 1) hazards to the public, environment, and nearby schools through the routine use, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials ; and 2) impairment of emergency response and evacuation plans from construction-related road closures or detours. Similar to the proposed project, these impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels via compliance with applicable regulations; and submission of building plans to the VFD for review and approval. Also similar to the DVSP Update, the No Project Alternative would have the potential to result in significant impacts to persons or the environment as a result of previous land uses that used or generated hazardous materials or wastes. The mitigation measures proposed in Section 4.7, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, would be required to reduce impacts associated with this alternative to a less than significant level.

## **Hydrology and Water Quality**

Required compliance with the City's Stormwater Ordinance and Groundwater Ordinance, including preparation of an erosion control plan and implementation of minimum BMP requirements, would ensure that construction required for future development under SP #26 would not result in a significant impact to individual project site hydrology, similar to the DVSP Update. However, impacts associated with

flooding would be increased under the No Project Alternative because the drainage improvements proposed in the DVSP Update, including the new Santa Fe Avenue drainage basin along Tributary 1, would not be implemented. Existing condition peak flows would continue to exceed existing drainage channel capacity at the confluence of Buena Vista Creek and Tributary 1, resulting in flooding. The downtown area would remain within the 100-year flood area under this alternative. Impacts would be significant and mitigation would be required. The No Project Alternative would result in reduced development of land uses as compared to the DVSP Update; however, some new development would occur and water quality impacts from sediment-laden runoff during construction and operational pollutants post-construction would be similar to the DVSP Update. Implementation of BMPs according to the City's Stormwater Standards Manual, and compliance with the SUSMP through the Stormwater Ordinance, the City's Grading Ordinance, and required NPDES permits would reduce water quality impacts of the No Project Alternative to a less than significant level, similar to the DVSP Update.

### **Land Use and Planning**

Similar to the DVSP Update, the No Project Alternative would not result in an impact with regard to conflicts with neighboring land uses or the physical division of an established community because similar types of activities and uses would occur in the downtown area under both scenarios. Additionally, similar to the DVSP Update, the No Project Alternative would be consistent with all applicable adopted land use plans, policies and regulations except Goal 1, Policy 1.2, and Policy 1.7 of the General Plan Circulation Element and Criterion E of the Community Facilities Element because several intersections currently operate at a LOS E or LOS F, or would operate at a LOS E or LOS F in 2030 without implementation of the DVSP Update. As shown in Table 4.14-6, Peak Hour Intersection LOS Results - Existing Conditions, the S. Santa Fe Avenue/Orange Street intersection currently operates at LOS E during AM peak hour and LOS F during the PM peak hour, and the Pala Vista Drive/S. Santa Fe Avenue intersection operates at LOS E during the PM peak hour. As shown in Table 4.14-10, 2030 SPA Peak Hour Intersection LOS and Delays - With and Without Project, the following intersections would operate at an unacceptable LOS without implementation of the DVSP Update:

- Melrose Drive/Olive Avenue (LOS E, PM Peak Hour)
- Santa Fe Avenue/E. Broadway (LOS E, PM Peak Hour)
- Pala Vista Drive/Santa Fe Avenue (LOS F, PM Peak Hour)
- Escondido Avenue/Santa Fe Avenue (LOS F, PM Peak Hour)
- Vale Terrace/Vista Way (LOS E, AM Peak Hour)
- Escondido Avenue/Eucalyptus Avenue (LOS F, PM Peak Hour)

Therefore, the No Project Alternative would result in a significant impact related to consistency with the General Plan, similar to the proposed project. Mitigation measures similar to those proposed in Section 4.14, Traffic, would be required.

### **Noise**

Similar to the DVSP Update, the No Project Alternative would result in permanent increases in ambient noise levels from operation of new development and redevelopment including parking lot noise, truck deliveries, and HVAC systems associated with new commercial development, and nuisance noise from new residential development. Temporary noise impacts and groundborne vibration impacts from construction of the approved projects under this alternative would be similar to the DVSP Update because land uses accommodated under the No Project Alternative would be similar to the DVSP Update and would require similar construction activities. Similar to the DVSP Update, impacts would be potentially significant and the mitigation measures proposed in Section 4.10, Noise, would be required to reduce them to a less than significant level. Less than significant impacts to traffic noise would be reduced under this alternative because vehicle trips associated with this alternative would be reduced as compared to the

DVSP Update. Similar to the DVSP Update, the No Project Alternative would not expose people to aircraft noise.

### **Population and Housing**

Similar to the DVSP Update, the No Project Alternative would directly and indirectly induce population growth; however, this growth is consistent with forecasted growth for the City. Additionally, similar to the DVSP Update, the No Project Alternative would accommodate the construction of new housing in the downtown area and would not displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

### **Public Services**

Demand for services from the SDCSD and VUSD currently exceed the capacity of these service providers. Therefore, similar to the DVSP Update, future development under the No Project Alternative would result in an increase in demand for police and school services that would have the potential to exceed the capacity of existing SDCSD or VUSD facilities requiring the construction of new facilities or substantial alterations to existing facilities, the effects of which could have significant environmental impacts. Similar to the DVSP Update, implementation of the mitigation measures proposed in Section 4.12, Public Services, would be required to reduce impacts under this alternative to a less than significant level. The VFD would have adequate facilities to serve future development in the SPA under No Project Alternative, similar to the DVSP Update. These impacts would be less than significant.

### **Recreation**

The No Project Alternative would not result in the removal of existing recreational activities; however, the new recreational opportunities proposed under the DVSP Update would not be constructed under this alternative. The design and development guidelines of the DVSP Update would provide new recreational development concurrently with new development/redevelopment and aid the City in maintaining its goal of 4.49 acres of parkland for every 1,000 residents. The No Project Alternative would not implement such requirements, but would accommodate new growth in the SPA consistent with existing plans. Therefore, future growth under the No Project Alternative would result in increased demand on existing recreational facilities and would result in a greater impact associated with the deterioration of these facilities because this alternative would not implement design and development guidelines to aid the City in meeting its parkland goal. Impacts to existing recreational facilities under this alternative would be greater than the proposed project and potentially significant. However, because the No Project Alternative would not require new recreational facilities to be provided in the SPA, it would result in fewer environmental impacts associated with the construction or expansion of recreational facilities in the SPA as compared to the DVSP Update. These impacts would be less than significant.

### **Traffic**

The No Project Alternative would accommodate less intensive growth in the downtown area as compared to the DVSP Update; therefore, increases in traffic would be somewhat reduced under this alternative. However, DVSP Update proposed roadway and intersection improvements would not be implemented under this alternative, resulting in a greater traffic impact as compared to the proposed project. As shown in Table 4.14-10, 2030 SPA Peak Hour Intersection LOS and Delays - With and Without Project, the following intersections would operate at an unacceptable LOS without implementation of the DVSP Update:

- Melrose Drive/Olive Avenue (LOS E, PM Peak Hour)
- Santa Fe Avenue/E. Broadway (LOS E, PM Peak Hour)
- Pala Vista Drive/Santa Fe Avenue (LOS F, PM Peak Hour)
- Escondido Avenue/Santa Fe Avenue (LOS F, PM Peak Hour)

- Vale Terrace/Vista Way (LOS E, AM Peak Hour)
- Escondido Avenue/Eucalyptus Avenue (LOS F, PM Peak Hour)

Impacts would be anticipated to be significant and require mitigation, similar to the proposed project. Less than significant impacts associated with potential hazards from traffic queuing at driveways would be reduced under this alternative because traffic would be reduced in the SPA as compared to the DVSP Update. Similar to the DVSP Update, impacts associated with emergency access would be mitigated to a less than significant impact with mitigation measure *Haz-3*. Additionally, less than significant parking supply impacts would be similar under this alternative as compared to the DVSP Update, because future development under the No Project Alternative would be required to comply with existing parking regulations. The No Project Alternative would not implement the design and development guidelines that promote transit-oriented development and pedestrian use, but would not be anticipated to conflict with the existing alternative transportation services provided in the SPA because future development under this alternative would be required to be compatible with existing land uses under SP #26. Therefore, similar to the DVSP Update, conflicts with alternative transportation would be less than significant.

### Utilities

Similar to the DVSP Update, the No Project Alternative would not result in a significant impact associated with an increase in the demand for wastewater treatment or energy because adequate wastewater treatment and energy facilities are in place to serve development under the No Project Alternative. However, the No Project Alternative would not implement the stormwater improvements proposed in the DVSP Update that would remove the SPA from the 100-year floodplain. As stated above under Hydrology and Water Quality, the capacity of Buena Vista Creek at the confluence with Tributary 1 of approximately 1,000 cfs would continue to be exceeded under the No Project Alternative. Therefore, stormwater facilities would be inadequate under this alternative and would result in a significant impact. As discussed in Section 4.15.5.1, Issue 1 – Water Supply and Infrastructure, the Water Supply Technical Study (Appendix K) determined that ultimate build-out of the existing land uses proposed for SPA would result in a greater demand for water as compared to ultimate build-out of the land uses proposed under the DVSP Update. This is attributed, in part, to a greater number of residential units allowed under the ultimate build-out of the existing General Plan and SP #26 (1,723 units) as compared to the number of units allowed under the build-out of the DVSP Update (1,680 units). Therefore, the No Project Alternative would result in a greater demand on water supply than the DVSP Update. Similar to the DVSP Update, development under No Project Alternative would not exceed the capacity of Miramar Landfill and would not result in significant impact associated with solid waste disposal or compliance with AB 939.

#### 6.3.1.2 Ability to Accomplish Project Objectives

Under the No Project Alternative, the existing SP #26 would remain the applicable planning document for the area within its boundary, and the existing City General Plan would remain the applicable planning document for the areas of the proposed boundary expansion outside of the existing SP #26 boundary. The No Project Alternative would accomplish only one of the twelve objectives identified for the DVSP Update. This alternative would meet Objective 4 because landscape design guidelines exist for the SPA. The No Project Alternative would partially meet two other objectives. This alternative would partially meet Objective 3 because it would accommodate new commercial and residential development opportunities, but not to the extent of the DVSP Update. This alternative would partially meet Objective 9 because it would accommodate multi-family residential and mixed-use residential development, but would not accommodate live/work units or senior housing development. The No Project Alternative would not meet Objective 1 because it would not develop four distinct planning areas; Objective 2 because it would not identify design and development guidelines for four distinct planning areas;

Objective 5 because it would not implement the proposed circulation improvements; Objective 6 because it would not implement the proposed water, sewer and storm drain infrastructure improvements; Objective 7 because it would not create a Character Overlay Zone to preserve the historic downtown area; Objective 8 because it would not improve pedestrian, bicycle and transit facilities and corridors; Objective 8 because it would not implement design and development guidelines to increase public safety by clearly delineating pedestrian circulation; Objective 11 because it would not implement the sustainable development principles; or Objective 12 because it would not create an 18-hour activity area at the core of the SPA.

## **6.3.2 REDUCED PROJECT ALTERNATIVE**

The Reduced Project Alternative would implement the proposed DVSP Update; however, the area that the plan would apply to would be reduced to the original SP #26 boundary shown in Figure 1-2. This area includes portions of PA-3, PA-1a, and PA-2. PA-4 and PA-1b would be eliminated under this alternative. The area-wide design and development plan, as well as the planning area specific design and development plans, for the three applicable planning areas (PA-1a, PA-2, and PA-3) would be implemented. In the original SP #26 boundary, the development densities that would be accommodated under the proposed DVSP Update would be accommodated by the Reduced Project Alternative; however, overall development would be reduced because the development accommodated under the DVSP Update outside of the SP #26 boundary would not be implemented under the Reduced Project Alternative. This alternative would reduce the size of the SPA by approximately 35 percent. Based on this reduction, the Reduced Project Alternative would accommodate a total of approximately 1,090 dwelling units and 1,706,155 SF of development, compared to 1,675 dwelling units and 2,624,854 SF of development under the DVSP Update. The existing City General Plan would remain the applicable planning document for the area outside of the original SP #26 boundary.

### **6.3.2.1 Impact Analysis**

#### **Aesthetics**

Similar to the DVSP Update, the Reduced Project Alternative would result in less than significant impacts to scenic vistas and visual character and quality within the original SP #26 area because future development in the reduced SPA would be the same as proposed under the DVSP Update, which would not affect any designated scenic vistas and would enhance the overall visual character and quality of the downtown area. However, the areas outside of the original SP #26 would remain the same and would not be redeveloped. These areas would not be subject to area-wide and planning area specific design and development guidelines, and would not result in improvements to visual character. Therefore, impacts associated with visual character and quality would be increased as compared to the proposed project. Less than significant impacts associated with lighting and glare would be reduced under the Reduced Project Alternative because the total amount of development accommodated by this alternative would be less than the total amount accommodated under the DVSP Update.

#### **Air Quality**

The Reduced Project Alternative would result in similar less than significant impacts as the DVSP Update with regard to consistency with the applicable air quality plan because the Reduced Project Alternative would accommodate reduced growth as compared to the DVSP Update and would be consistent with or below SANDAG population forecasts utilized in the air quality plan. Additionally, similar to the DVSP Update, the land uses accommodated under the Reduced Project Alternative do not typically result in the production of objectionable odors. Therefore, similar to the DVSP Update, the Reduced Project Alternative would result in less than significant impacts to these issues.

Similar to the proposed DVSP Update, the Reduced Project Alternative would accommodate mixed-use development with the potential to expose sensitive receptors to TACs from nearby gas stations and dry cleaners; however, mitigation would reduce impacts to below a significant level. Compared to the DVSP Update, the Reduced Project Alternative would result in reduced impacts in terms of consistency with air quality standards because build-out of the proposed SPA under this alternative would be reduced by approximately 35 percent in comparison to the DVSP Update. As a result, construction, operational, and vehicular emissions would be reduced; however, development would still be likely to exceed the thresholds for significance, and mitigation measures similar to those proposed in Section 4.2, Air Quality, would be required.

### **Biological Resources**

The Reduced Project Alternative would have a reduced impact to Diegan coastal sage scrub, and the sensitive species supported by this habitat, compared to the DVSP Update because the SPA under the Reduced Project Alternative would not include the Diegan coastal sage scrub on the edge of PA-1b. However, this alternative would have the potential to impact the exotic riparian woodland habitat located in PA-2, including the migratory species potentially supported by this habitat. Similar to the DVSP Update, the mitigation required in Section 4.3, Biological Resources, would be required to mitigate the potential impact to this habitat and associated migratory species. Additionally, future development adjacent to Buena Vista Creek or its tributaries would have the potential to result in a significant impact to a jurisdictional waterway; however, impacts would be reduced under this alternative because a large above-ground portion of Tributary 1 would not be located in the reduced SPA area. Although impacts would be reduced, this alternative would still have the potential to result in a significant impact to jurisdictional waterways and would require implementation of a mitigation measure similar to the one proposed in Section 4.3, Biological Resources. Also similar to the DVSP Update, implementation of this alternative would not conflict with adopted plans, policies, and regulations because the reduced SPA is not identified for conservation as a BCRA or FPA in the North County MSCP. Additionally, future development would be required to conform to the NCCP Guidelines. Therefore, implementation of the Reduced Project Alternative would not conflict with the North County MHCP or NCCP, similar to the DVSP Update.

### **Climate Change**

The Reduced Project Alternative is reduced in scope compared to the proposed DVSP Update and would accommodate a smaller total build-out. Additionally, this alternative would implement the sustainability guidelines in the DVSP Update that would reduce GHG emissions compared to BAU. Therefore, GHG emissions from vehicular sources, energy consumption, water use, solid waste, and GHG emissions during construction and operation would be reduced under this alternative as compared to the DVSP Update. Similar to the DVSP Update, impacts would be less than significant.

### **Cultural Resources**

Development under the Reduced Project Alternative would have the potential to involve the demolition and/or remodeling of potentially significant historical buildings in the SPA or impact potentially significant archaeological resources or human remains during ground disturbing construction activities. Therefore, similar to the DVSP Update, the mitigation measures proposed in Section 4.5, Cultural Resources, would be required to reduce impacts, although not to below a significant level. The discovery of human remains would comply with applicable State law and be less than significant, similar to the DVSP Update. Similar to the DVSP Update, impacts to paleontological resources would be less than significant because the underlying soils have low potential to contain paleontological resources.

## **Geology and Soils**

Similar to the proposed project, the Reduced Project Alternative would result in less than significant impacts for geologic hazards, unstable soils, and expansive soils because future development would be required to comply with IBC and CBC standards and implement site-specific geotechnical investigation recommendations. Additionally, implementation of required BMPs would ensure that impacts associated with soil erosion would be less than significant, similar to the DVSP Update.

## **Hazards/Hazardous Materials**

Similar to the DVSP Update, compliance with applicable regulations and submission of building plans to the VFD for review and approval would reduce to a less than significant level impacts associated with: 1) hazards to the public, environment, and nearby schools through the routine use, transport, disposal, or the accidental release of hazardous materials; and 2) impairment of emergency response and evacuation plans from construction-related road closures or detours. Also similar to the DVSP Update, future development under the Reduced Project Alternative would have the potential to result in significant impacts to persons or the environment as a result of previous land uses that utilized or generated hazardous materials or wastes. The mitigation measures proposed in Section 4.7, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, would be required to reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

## **Hydrology and Water Quality**

Required compliance with the City's Stormwater Ordinance and Groundwater Ordinance, including preparation of an erosion control plan and implementation of minimum BMP requirements, would ensure that construction required for future development projects under SP #26 would not result in a significant impact to individual site hydrology, similar to the DVSP Update. Impacts associated with flooding post-construction would be increased under the Reduced Project Alternative because the drainage improvements within the reduced SPA boundary would not include the new Santa Fe drainage basin along Tributary 1 at the corner of Santa Fe Avenue and Monte Vista Drive. The existing peak flow for the 100-year storm event at the confluence of Buena Vista Creek and Tributary 1 exceeds the available capacity of the drainage channel, resulting in flooding. Without the improvements proposed under the DVSP Update, flows would not be reduced below the available cfs capacity of the drainage channel and SPA would continue to be located within the 100-year floodplain. A significant impact would occur. Potentially significant water quality impacts during construction activities and post-construction would be similar to the DVSP Update because this alternative would accommodate the development of similar types of uses that have the potential to generate pollutants and would require similar construction activities. Similar to the DVSP Update, implementation of BMPs according to the City's Stormwater Standards Manual, and compliance with the SUSMP through the Stormwater Ordinance, the City's Grading Ordinance, and required NPDES permits would reduce water quality impacts of the Reduced Project Alternative to a less than significant level.

## **Land Use and Planning**

Similar to the DVSP Update, the Reduced Project Alternative would not result in an impact with regard to conflicts with neighboring land uses or the physical division of an established community because similar types of activities and uses would occur in the downtown area under both scenarios. The Reduced Project Alternative would result in reduced conflict associated with the Circulation Element and Community Facilities Element due to reduced traffic impacts as compared to the DVSP Update; however, similar to the DVSP Update, impacts associated with traffic would remain potentially significant and unavoidable. Therefore, similar to the DVSP Update, the Reduced Project Alternative would result in a significant and unmitigable impact related to conflicts with the City's General Plan.

## **Noise**

Similar to the DVSP Update, the Reduced Project Alternative would result in permanent increases in ambient noise levels from operation of new development, including parking lot noise, truck deliveries, and HVAC systems associated with new commercial development, and nuisance noise from new residential development, because land uses proposed under this alternative are similar those proposed under the DVSP Update. Temporary noise impacts and groundborne vibration impacts from construction of the approved projects under this alternative would be similar to the DVSP Update because land uses accommodated under the Reduced Project Alternative would be similar to the DVSP Update and would require similar construction activities. Similar to the DVSP Update, impacts would be potentially significant and the mitigation measures proposed in Section 4.10, Noise, would be required to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Less than significant impacts to traffic noise would also be reduced under this alternative because vehicle trips associated with this alternative would be reduced as compared to the DVSP Update. Similar to the DVSP Update, the Reduced Project Alternative would not expose people to aircraft noise.

## **Population and Housing**

Similar to the DVSP Update, the Reduced Project Alternative would be consistent with forecasted growth for the City. Additionally, similar to the DVSP Update, the Reduced Project Alternative would accommodate the construction of new housing in the downtown area and would not displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. Therefore, similar to the DVSP Update, impacts would be less than significant.

## **Public Services**

Demand for services from the SDCSD and VUSD currently exceed the capacity of these service providers. Therefore, similar to the DVSP Update, future development under the Reduced Project Alternative would result in an increase in demand for police and school services that would exceed the capacity of existing police and school facilities requiring new facilities or substantial alterations to existing facilities, the construction of which could result in significant environmental effects. Implementation of the mitigation measures proposed in Section 4.12, Public Services, would be required to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. The VFD would have adequate facilities to serve future development under Reduced Project Alternative because the VFD has adequate facilities to serve the DVSP Update, and development under the Reduced Project Alternative would be reduced as compared to the Reduced Project Alternative. Impacts would be less than significant.

## **Recreation**

The Reduced Project Alternative would not result in the removal of existing recreational activities. Additionally, the design and development guidelines proposed in the DVSP Update that encourage recreational facilities throughout the SPA concurrent with development would also be implemented under this alternative. Therefore, this alternative would result in the development of some new recreational facilities in the reduced SPA which would aid the City in meeting its parkland goal. The Reduced Project Alternative would result in a similar less than significant impact associated with deterioration of existing recreational facilities as the DVSP Update. Less than significant impacts associated with construction or expansion of recreational facilities would be reduced under this alternative because fewer facilities would be developed under the Reduced Project Alternative, as compared to the DVSP Update, since overall the development area would be reduced by 35 percent.

## **Traffic**

Impacts to roadway and intersection LOS within the Reduced Project Alternative boundary would be reduced as compared to the DVSP Update because the reduced SPA would not include traffic from

development in PA-4 or PA-1b. Therefore, increases in traffic on roadways within the reduced SPA boundary would be reduced as compared to the proposed project. However, traffic impacts would still be anticipated to be significant and unavoidable, even with implementation of the mitigation measures proposed in Section 4.14, Traffic, similar to the DVSP Update. The Reduced Project Alternative would also mitigate impacts associated with traffic hazard from vehicles queuing at driveways with implementation of mitigation measure **Haz-3**, similar to the proposed project. Additionally, parking supply impacts would be similar under this alternative, as compared to the DVSP Update, because future development would be required to comply with parking requirements established in the DVSP Update. The Reduced Project Alternative would encourage walkability within the alternative boundary and would encourage utilization of the Vista Transit Center through implementation of the design and development guidelines. This alternative would not improve walkability between the planning area and the Sprinter station at Escondido Avenue. However, this alternative would not result in a conflict with existing alternative transportation services. Therefore, impacts to alternative transportation under this alternative would be less than significant, similar to the DVSP Update.

### Utilities

The Reduced Project Alternative would not result in a significant increase in demand for wastewater treatment or energy that would require the construction or expansion of new facilities because development under this alternative would accommodate reduced development as compared to the DVSP Update and adequate wastewater treatment facilities and energy infrastructure are in place to serve larger DVSP Update. However, the Reduced Project Alternative would not implement the stormwater improvements proposed in the DVSP Update that would remove the SPA from the 100-year floodplain and improve drainage conditions so the drainage channel capacity is no longer exceeded. Therefore, stormwater facilities would be inadequate to serve the development proposed under this alternative and a significant impact would occur. As discussed in Section 4.15.5.1, Issue 1 – Water Supply and Infrastructure, the WSTS (Appendix K) determined that adequate water supplies would be available for the ultimate build-out of the land uses proposed in the DVSP Update. The Reduced Project Alternative proposes similar land uses in a reduced SPA; therefore, impacts would be less than significant, similar to the DVSP Update. Finally, similar to the DVSP Update, development under the Reduced Project Alternative would not exceed the capacity of Miramar Landfill and would not result in significant impact associated with solid waste disposal or a conflict with AB 939.

### 6.3.2.2 Ability to Accomplish Project Objectives

The Reduced Project Alternative would meet six of the 12 objectives identified for the DVSP Update, and would partially fulfill five other objectives. This alternative would not fulfill Objective 12 because it would not create an 18-hour activity area at the core of the SPA. The 18-hour activity area is proposed in PA-4, which is not included in the reduced SPA boundary. Specifically, the activity area would concentrate amenities in close proximity to the Escondido Avenue Sprinter station, an area which is not included in the Reduced Project Alternative boundary. This alternative would meet Objective 4 because it would implement the proposed landscape design guidelines in the reduced SPA. It would fulfill Objective 2 because it would identify design and development guidelines for the reduced SPA. This alternative would fulfill Objective 7 because it would create a Character Overlay Zone in the historic downtown area. The Reduced Project Alternative would fulfill Objective 9 because it would accommodate a variety of housing types, including mixed-use residential and live/work units. The Reduced Project Alternative would fulfill Objective 10 because it would implement the proposed design and development guidelines to increase public safety by clearly delineating pedestrian circulation, and would fulfill Objective 11 because it would implement the proposed sustainable development principles. The Reduced Project Alternative would partially meet Objective 1 because it would develop three, but not four, distinct planning areas. It would partially fulfill Objective 3 because it would accommodate new

commercial and residential development opportunities, but not to the extent of the DVSP Update. The Reduced Project Alternative would partially fulfill Objectives 5 and 6 because it would implement some of the proposed circulation and infrastructure improvements identified for the DVSP Update, but only those proposed within the Reduced Project Alternative boundary. Objective 8 would be partially fulfilled because this alternative would improve pedestrian, bicycle and transit facilities and corridors surrounding the Vista Transit Center, but would not provide improved connectivity to the Escondido Avenue Sprinter Station.

### **6.3.3 EXPANDED STREET CONFIGURATION ALTERNATIVE**

Under this alternative, S. Santa Fe Avenue would not be narrowed to two lanes through PA-3. S. Santa Fe Avenue would be four lanes throughout the planning area and would include a median. Additionally, Olive Avenue would be extended across the NCTD railroad tracks to connect to W. Orange Street. The connection of Olive Avenue to Vista Village Way would be removed and Olive Avenue would end at a dead-end at Vista Village Way. This would encourage traffic to utilize Melrose Drive to connect to the neighborhoods northeast of the SPA, instead of S. Santa Fe Avenue. The proposed DVSP Update would be implemented under this alternative, including the SPA boundary expansion, all design and development guidelines, proposed land use densities, and public infrastructure and circulation improvements, with the exception of narrowing S. Santa Fe Avenue to two lanes through PA-3. Under the DVSP Update, S. Santa Fe Avenue would be narrowed to incorporate pedestrian circulation improvements to encourage walkability in PA-3. Under the Expanded Street Configuration Alternative, S. Santa Fe Avenue would be a major thoroughfare through the SPA.

Because the DVSP Update design and development guidelines, proposed land use densities, and public infrastructure and circulation improvements would all be implemented under this alternative, with the only exception of narrowing S. Santa Fe Avenue to two lanes, most impacts under this alternative would be the same as those identified for the DVSP Update. Therefore, this analysis focuses only on the impacts that would be reduced under this alternative, which are the impacts related to traffic/circulation on S. Santa Fe Avenue. Impacts that would be the same under this alternative as those identified for the DVSP Update include aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, climate change, cultural resources, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, noise, population and housing, public services, and utilities.

#### **6.3.3.1 Impact Analysis**

##### **Land Use and Planning**

Similar to the DVSP Update, the Expanded Street Configuration Alternative would not result in a conflict with neighboring land uses or the physical division of an established community because the same types of activities and uses would occur in the downtown area under both scenarios. Additionally, the Expanded Street Configuration Alternative would result in fewer impacts related to consistency with adopted land use plans, policies, and regulations because the Expanded Street Configuration Alternative would result in fewer traffic impacts that would conflict with General Plan policies, as compared to the DVSP Update. However, the Expanded Street Configuration Alternative would still result in a significant traffic impact, similar to the DVSP Update. Impacts would be significant.

##### **Recreation**

The Expanded Street Configuration Alternative would not result in the removal of existing recreational activities. However, while most of the recreational facilities proposed in the DVSP Update would be constructed under this alternative, the Expanded Street Alternative would not encourage the mid-block

pedestrian areas that would be encouraged under the DVSP Update because S. Santa Fe Avenue would remain a major thoroughfare and enhanced pedestrian paths to create pedestrian activity areas would not be implemented. Therefore, this alternative would not aid the City in meeting its parkland goals to the extent of the DVSP Update. The Expanded Street Configuration Alternative would result in fewer impacts associated with construction or expansion of recreational facilities because fewer facilities would be developed under this alternative in PA-3, compared to the DVSP Update.

## Traffic

The Expanded Street Configuration Alternative would accommodate the same amount of growth in the downtown area compared the DVSP Update; therefore, increases in traffic would be the same under this alternative. However, the street configuration would be modified under this alternative. Table 6-3 compares impacts to intersections at build-out under this alternative to intersection impacts associated with the DVSP Update (Year 2030). As shown in this table, the Expanded Street Alternative would result in a significant impact to the following intersections:

- Melrose Drive/Olive Avenue (LOS E in AM Peak Hour, LOS F in PM Peak Hour)
- Santa Fe Avenue/E. Broadway (LOS F, PM Peak Hour)
- Santa Fe Avenue/Guajome Avenue (LOS E, PM Peak Hour)
- Pala Vista Drive/Santa Fe Avenue (LOS F, AM and PM Peak Hour)
- Escondido Avenue/Santa Fe Avenue (LOS F, PM Peak Hour)
- Vale Terrace/Vista Way (LOS E, AM Peak Hour)
- Escondido Avenue/Eucalyptus Way (LOS F, PM Peak Hour)

The DVSP Update would also result in a significant impact to these intersections. The significant impact to each intersection would be reduced under the Expanded Street Configuration Alternative, as compared to the DVSP Update, with the exception of the Melrose Drive/Olive Avenue intersection. Additionally, the Expanded Street Configuration Alternative would not result in a significant impact to the Santa Fe Avenue/Main Street intersection or the Escondido Avenue/Postal Way intersection. The DVSP Update would significantly impact both of these intersections. Therefore, impacts associated with increases in traffic volumes would be reduced under this alternative. However, mitigation measures *Tra-1*, *Tra-3* through *Tra-5*, *Tra-7*, and *Tra-8* in Section 4.14 would still be required to reduce impacts under this alternative. Table 6-4 shows the impacts of the Expanded Street Configuration Alternative with mitigation. As shown in this table, all impacts to these intersections would be reduced to below a level of significance with mitigation under the Expanded Street Configuration Alternative.

Similar to the DVSP Update, this alternative would reduce impacts associated with emergency access to a less than significant level with implementation of mitigation measure *Haz-3*. Additionally, parking supply impacts under this alternative would be similar to the DVSP Update because future development under this alternative would be required to comply with the parking requirements proposed in the DVSP Update. Impacts associated with alternative transportation would be slightly greater under this alternative because improvements to pedestrian facilities along S. Santa Fe Avenue in PA-3 would be fewer under the Expanded Street Configuration Alternative.

**Table 6-3. 2030 Roadway Segment LOS - Without Project, DVSP Update, and Expanded Street Configuration Alternative**

| Intersection   | Without DVSP Update Implementation |                  | Proposed DVSP Update |                      | Expanded Street Configuration Alternative |                  |
|--|------------------------------------|------------------|----------------------|----------------------|---|------------------|
|  | AM Delay-LOS                       | PM Delay-LOS     | AM Delay-LOS         | PM Delay-LOS         | AM Delay-LOS                              | PM Delay-LOS     |
| <b>Melrose Drive / Olive Avenue</b>                      | <b>43.3 - D</b>                    | <b>55.3 - E</b>  | <b>51.3 - D</b>      | <b>67.2 - E</b>      | <b>71.0 - E</b>                           | <b>96.3 - F</b>  |
| Valencia Drive / Vista Way                               | 13.8 - B                           | 10.9 - B         | 12.9 - B             | 9.7 - A              | 12.6 - B                                  | 10.4 - B         |
| Santa Fe Avenue / Townsite Drive                         | 26.0 - C                           | 27.3 - C         | 26.9 - C             | 28.7 - C             | 28.1 - C                                  | 33.1 - C         |
| Santa Fe Avenue / Orange Street                          | 2.4 - A                            | 2.1 - A          | 2.3 - A              | 2.4 - A              | 7.6 - A                                   | 6.9 - A          |
| Santa Fe Avenue / Vista Village Drive                    | 34.0 - C                           | 35.2 - D         | 44.0 - D             | 50.3 - D             | 36.6 - D                                  | 39.9 - D         |
| Olive Avenue / Vista Village Drive                       | 11.3 - B                           | 11.5 - B         | 15.0 - B             | 15.0 - B             | 11.8 - B                                  | 12.3 - B         |
| Rec Drive / Vista Village Drive                          | 19.7 - B                           | 28.4 - C         | 19.1 - B             | 29.3 - C             | 20.3 - C                                  | 25.0 - C         |
| Vista Village Drive / Vista Way                          | 15.0 - B                           | 19.3 - B         | 20.1 - C             | 33.8 - C             | 19.0 - B                                  | 325 - C          |
| Vista Village Drive / Lado De Loma Drive                 | 9.5 - A                            | 17.6 - B         | 7.4 - A              | 13.4 - B             | 7.9 - A                                   | 13.7 - B         |
| Vista Village Drive / SR-78 WB Ramps                     | 23.1 - C                           | 24.6 - C         | 24.6 - C             | 33.2 - C             | 25.0 - C                                  | 32.1 - C         |
| Vista Village Drive / SR-78 EB Ramps                     | 16.6 - B                           | 26.4 - C         | 18.5 - B             | 29.1 - C             | 18.0 - B                                  | 29.9 - C         |
| Vista Village Drive / Hacienda Drive                     | 34.6 - C                           | 25.9 - C         | 33.6 - C             | 24.0 - C             | 33.4 - C                                  | 25.8 - C         |
| <b>Santa Fe Avenue / Main Street</b>                     | <b>11.1 - B</b>                    | <b>21.5 - C</b>  | <b>86.0 - F</b>      | <b>85.1 - F</b>      | <b>15.3 - B</b>                           | <b>32.1 - C</b>  |
| <b>Santa Fe Avenue / E. Broadway <sup>(1)</sup></b>      | <b>16.1 - C</b>                    | <b>48.4 - E</b>  | <b>88.7 - F</b>      | <b>&gt;999.9 - F</b> | <b>19.4 - C</b>                           | <b>151.6 - F</b> |
| <b>Santa Fe Avenue / Guajome Street</b>                  | <b>23.0 - C</b>                    | <b>34.6 - C</b>  | <b>166.4 - F</b>     | <b>290.9 - F</b>     | <b>29.7 - C</b>                           | <b>58.6 - E</b>  |
| <b>Pala Vista Drive / Santa Fe Avenue <sup>(1)</sup></b> | <b>27.7 - D</b>                    | <b>102.1 - F</b> | <b>87.8 - F</b>      | <b>&gt;999.9 - F</b> | <b>55.6 - F</b>                           | <b>545.1 - F</b> |
| <b>Escondido Avenue / Santa Fe Avenue</b>                | <b>28.7 - C</b>                    | <b>114.9 - F</b> | <b>42.1 - D</b>      | <b>165.9 - F</b>     | <b>40.1 - D</b>                           | <b>142.2 - F</b> |
| Postal Way / Santa Fe Avenue                             | 16.7 - B                           | 18.8 - B         | 17.1 - B             | 17.7 - B             | 16.1 - B                                  | 21.2 - C         |
| Santa Fe Avenue / Monte Vista Drive                      | 16.4 - B                           | 21.4 - C         | 16.2 - B             | 25.7 - C             | 20.2 - C                                  | 29.4 - C         |
| Citrus Avenue / Vista Village Drive                      | 14.1 - B                           | 16.1 - B         | 15.0 - B             | 17.7 - B             | 10.0 - A                                  | 12.2 - B         |
| Main Street / Vista Village Drive                        | 16.0 - B                           | 11.7 - B         | 20.0 - C             | 15.8 - B             | 16.0 - B                                  | 14.3 - B         |
| Escondido Avenue / Vista Way                             | 27.1 - C                           | 27.2 - C         | 22.4 - C             | 43.7 - D             | 22.6 - C                                  | 40.4 - D         |
| Vista Way / Townsite Drive                               | 11.1 - B                           | 22.8 - C         | 11.1 - B             | 22.1 - C             | 11.1 - B                                  | 23.1 - C         |
| <b>Vale Terrace / Vista Way</b>                          | <b>58.1 - E</b>                    | <b>46.7 - D</b>  | <b>73.7 - E</b>      | <b>56.6 - E</b>      | <b>74.2 - E</b>                           | <b>52.1 - D</b>  |
| Escondido Avenue / Alta Vista Drive                      | 12.6 - B                           | 15.4 - B         | 8.3 - A              | 11.6 - B             | 8.8 - A                                   | 9.4 - A          |
| <b>Escondido Avenue / Eucalyptus Drive</b>               | <b>13.9 - B</b>                    | <b>84.6 - F</b>  | <b>26.9 - C</b>      | <b>155.0 - F</b>     | <b>23.5 - C</b>                           | <b>138.7 - F</b> |
| Escondido Avenue / Crescent Drive                        | 9.2 - A                            | 16.5 - B         | 9.9 - A              | 20.6 - C             | 9.4 - A                                   | 19.2 - B         |
| <b>Escondido Avenue / Postal Way</b>                     | <b>16.9 - B</b>                    | <b>21.6 - C</b>  | <b>16.8 - B</b>      | <b>68.0 - E</b>      | <b>16.9 - B</b>                           | <b>50.2 - D</b>  |
| Escondido Avenue / Pala Vista Drive                      | 9.1 - A                            | 20.7 - C         | 9.3 - A              | 19.3 - B             | 9.6 - A                                   | 18.6 - B         |
| Escondido Avenue / SR-78 WB Ramps                        | 14.2 - B                           | 38.7 - D         | 13.7 - B             | 32.5 - C             | 14.3 - B                                  | 35.9 - D         |
| Escondido Avenue / SR-78 EB Ramps                        | 11.8 - B                           | 20.2 - C         | 28.5 - C             | 17.8 - B             | 31.1 - C                                  | 20.0 - C         |
| Escondido Avenue / Crest View Road                       | 14.8 - B                           | 13.8 - B         | 14.5 - B             | 13.3 - B             | 14.4 - B                                  | 13.5 - B         |

<sup>(1)</sup> Unsignalized intersection - Delay shown is worst approach delay

Source: RBF Consulting, 2009

**Table 6-4. Intersection Delay and LOS with and Without DVSP Update Mitigation**

| Intersection                                      | Expanded Street Configuration Alternative without Mitigation |                  | Expanded Street Configuration Alternative with Mitigation |              |
|---|--|------------------|---|--------------|
|   | AM Delay-LOS   | PM Delay-LOS     | AM Delay-LOS  | PM Delay-LOS |
| Melrose Drive / Olive Avenue                      | <b>71.0 - E</b>  | <b>96.3 - F</b>  | 47.2 - D  | 45.4 - D     |
| Santa Fe Avenue / E. Broadway <sup>(1)</sup>      | 19.4 - C   | <b>151.6 - F</b> | 11.5 - B  | 20.4 - C     |
| Santa Fe Avenue / Guajome Street                  | 29.7 - C   | <b>58.6 - E</b>  | 22.6 - C  | 31.9 - C     |
| Pala Vista Drive / Santa Fe Avenue <sup>(1)</sup> | <b>55.6 - F</b>  | <b>545.1 - F</b> | 12.5 - B  | 10.9 - B     |
| Escondido Avenue / Santa Fe Avenue                | 40.1 - D   | <b>142.2 - F</b> | 26.8 - C  | 46.8 - D     |
| Vale Terrace / Vista Way                          | <b>74.2 - E</b>  | 52.1 - D         | 34.0 - C  | 46.8 - D     |
| Escondido Avenue / Eucalyptus Drive               | 23.5 - C   | <b>138.7 - F</b> | 20.9 - C  | 44.1 - D     |

<sup>(1)</sup> Unsignalized intersection - Delay shown is worst approach delay  
Source: RBF Consulting, 2009

### 6.3.3.2 Ability to Accomplish Project Goals

The Expanded Street Configuration Alternative would fully meet 10 of the 12 objectives identified for the DVSP Update and partially fulfill the other two objectives. This alternative would fulfill Objective 1 because it would develop four distinct planning areas; Objective 2 because it would identify design and development guidelines for four distinct planning areas; Objective 3 because it would accommodate the same new commercial and residential development opportunities as the DVSP Update; Objective 4 because it would implement the landscape design guidelines for the SPA; Objective 5 because it would improve traffic circulation; Objective 6 because it would implement the proposed water, sewer and storm drain infrastructure improvements; Objective 7 because it would create a Character Overlay Zone to preserve the historic downtown area; Objective 9 because it would accommodate a variety of housing types; Objective 11 because it would implement the sustainable development principles; and Objective 12 because it would create an 18-hour activity area at the core of the SPA. This alternative would partially fulfill Objective 8 because it would not improve pedestrian, bicycle and transit facilities and corridors in PA-3 to the extent provided under the DVSP Update; and partially fulfill Objective 10 because it would implement design and development guidelines to increase public safety by clearly delineating pedestrian circulation in most of the SPA, but pedestrian circulation would not be greatly improved along S. Santa Fe Avenue in PA-3.

## 6.4 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

According to Section 15126.6(e)(2) of the State CEQA Guidelines, an EIR is required to identify the environmentally superior alternative, which is the alternative having the potential for the fewest significant environmental impacts, from among the range of reasonable alternatives that are evaluated in the EIR. Table 6-1 provides a summary comparison of the alternatives evaluated in this PEIR with the purpose of highlighting whether the alternative would result in a similar, greater, or lesser impact compared to the DVSP Update. As shown in this table, the Reduced Project Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative. The Reduced Project Alternative would limit the DVSP Update area to the original SP #26 boundary shown in Figure 1-2, which includes only portions of PA-1a, PA-2, and PA-3. Because the overall development in the downtown area would be decreased compared to the

DVSP Update, impacts to nighttime lighting, air quality, biological resources, recreational facilities, and traffic would be less than those identified for the DVSP Update.

The Reduced Project Alternative would achieve the DVSP Update goals to implement landscape design guidelines, identify design and development guidelines, accommodate a variety of housing types, increase public safety by clearly delineating pedestrian circulation, implement the proposed sustainable development principles, and create a Character Overlay Zone. It would only partially fulfill the goals to develop four distinct planning areas, accommodate new commercial and residential development opportunities, improve circulation and infrastructure, and improve pedestrian, bicycle and transit facilities and corridors. This alternative would not fulfill the objective 12 to create an 18-hour activity area at the core of the SPA. Additionally, this alternative would result in a greater impacts associated with alternative transportation as compared to the DVSP Update.

This page intentionally left blank.