

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) for the proposed Alvarado Specific Plan (Specific Plan) and associated discretionary actions (collectively referred to throughout this PEIR as the “project”) has been prepared on behalf of the City of La Mesa (City) in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Statute and Guidelines (Public Resources Code [PRC], Section 21000 et seq. and California Code of Regulations [CCR], Title 14, Section 15000, et seq.).

The project analyzed in this PEIR is a master development plan for a phased transit-oriented development (TOD) and associated public improvements as outlined in the Specific Plan. The proposed Alvarado Specific Plan is a comprehensive planning document (i.e., specific plan) that provides the framework to guide project development within the Specific Plan area and contains site-specific development regulations that further implement the City’s General Plan.

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15121, the purpose of this PEIR is to provide public agency decision-makers and members of the public with detailed information about the potential significant environmental effects of the project, possible ways to minimize its significant effects, and reasonable alternatives that would reduce or avoid any identified significant effects.

ES.1 PROPOSED PROJECT

ES.1.1 Project Location and Setting

The Specific Plan area (project site) encompasses an approximately 12-acre site along the south side of Alvarado Road generally between 70th Street on the west and Guava Avenue on the east in the western portion of the City. The project site is bound by the 70th Street Trolley Station to the west, the Green Line trolley corridor to the south, a car dealership to the east, and Alvarado Road and Interstate 8 (I-8) to the north. The site is developed and currently contains a recreational vehicle (RV) resort facility with paved access roadways, RV spaces, a clubhouse, a swimming pool, other ancillary buildings, and three billboards. Alvarado Creek traverses the property as it flows under Alvarado Road in the eastern portion of the site and continues southwesterly and westerly along the southern boundary of the western portion of the site.

Alvarado Creek enters the site at the intersection of Alvarado Road on the east and continues through the site, bisecting the property until it enters an underground storm drainage facility in the western portion of the site. Alvarado Creek is channelized as it enters into the project site from the northeast and flows through a box culvert underneath a bridge over Alvarado Road. Alvarado Creek consists of a trapezoidal channel with concrete-lined banks and a natural channel bottom aside from the concrete aprons near the Alvarado Road overcrossing and at the western end of the site. Much of the channel supports vegetation including native and non-native species at varying vegetative cover, and water regularly flows through this section of Alvarado Creek.

Three freeway-oriented billboard signs are located within the project site along the Alvarado Road frontage. One is located at the eastern boundary of the site and is a single-sided sign oriented for viewers traveling along eastbound I-8. The other two signs occur in the western portion of site and are double sided. Overhead utility lines also cross over portions of the site that connect to 15 utility poles located throughout the site.

The project site is relatively level with a slight topographical variation as it slopes downward from east to west to the degree of approximately 10 feet. Existing on-site elevations range from approximately 400 feet above mean sea level (AMSL) to 410 AMSL.

ES.1.2 Project Description

The proposed project entails a master development plan (Specific Plan) for a phased transit-oriented development and associated public improvements. The project would include four development parcels that would be constructed in two phases. Phase 1 includes the parcels (Parcels 1-3) west of the intersection of Alvarado Creek and Alvarado Road. Phase 2 includes the parcel (Parcel 4) east of the intersection of Alvarado Creek and Alvarado Road. Each parcel would be developed with a multi-family residential building with ground-floor commercial uses.

Phase 1 would feature two multi-family residential buildings built on a podium deck over multi-level parking in the central portion of the site and a smaller-scale building in the western-most parcel. Phase 2 would include one building in the eastern portion of the site similar in size and scale to the two larger buildings constructed in Phase 1. The buildings would include up to five stories of residential units and one to three levels of parking. Each building would include a mix of housing types and sizes. In total, an estimated 850 to 950 residential units would be constructed at buildout. In addition to the residential uses, the project would include ground floor, resident-serving commercial uses.

The project would also include improvements to the Alvarado Creek channel within the project site, improvements to Alvarado Road, relocation of utilities, and pedestrian connection to the 70th Street Trolley Station.

ES.2 PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The goals and objectives of the project are to:

1. Address the City's housing supply needs by providing for the development of a mix of housing types to maximize the advantages of locating new infill housing in close proximity to existing regional transportation facilities, including the adjacent 70th Street Trolley Station, connecting bus routes, and freeway access;
2. Establish a land use plan that would improve public safety in the project area by providing public improvements at current City standards for Alvarado Road, construct channel improvements to address flooding conditions from Alvarado Creek, and relocation and improvement of existing sanitary sewer system infrastructure within the Alvarado Creek Flood Channel;
3. Provide high quality student housing with a short and direct link to San Diego State University from the 70th Street Trolley Station;
4. Establish a land use plan that would transform the site with private development and public improvements that would serve as a new and positive gateway image for the community;
5. Construct and maintain a multi-modal circulation system for vehicles, bicycles, and pedestrians to enhance accessibility and support active transportation and public transit use;

6. Transform Alvarado Creek within the Specific Plan Area into an urban creek and open space feature within a planned residential community;
7. Provide an environmentally sustainable residential development through the implementation of features such as energy conservation, sustainable landscape, water conservation, and support for alternative transportation, consistent with the City's Climate Action Plan (CAP); and
8. Create a unified private development plan that is consistent with the City's General Plan and SANDAG's San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan.

ES.3 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY/ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED

The Notice of Preparation (NOP) was distributed on May 21, 2019 for a 30-day public review and comment period, and a public scoping meeting was held on May 29, 2019 at the La Mesa Police Station located at 8085 University Avenue, La Mesa, California 91942. CEQA-related issues of potential controversy raised in response to the NOP include concerns related to regarding traffic, aesthetics, building heights, density, construction impacts, property management, property values, and residential unit types. Verbal and written comments received during the scoping process have been taken into consideration during the preparation of this PEIR. The NOP and comment letters are included in this PEIR as Appendix A.

ES.4 ALTERNATIVES

Section 15126.6(a) of the State CEQA Guidelines requires that EIRs describe "...a reasonable range of alternatives to a project, or the location of a project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives." Section 15126.6(f) of the State CEQA Guidelines further states that "the range of alternatives in an EIR is governed by the 'rule of reason' that requires the EIR to set forth only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice."

Alternatives to the proposed project are evaluated in Chapter 7, *Alternatives*, of this PEIR. The evaluations analyze the ability of each alternative to further reduce or avoid the significant environmental effects of the proposed project. Each major issue area included in the impact analysis of this PEIR has been given consideration in the alternatives analysis. This PEIR evaluates three alternatives to the project: No Project Alternative, Reduced Density Alternative, and Phase 1 Only Alternative.

ES.4.1 No Project Alternative

The No Project Alternative assumes that the project would not be adopted, no multi-family residential buildings would be constructed, and no public improvements to Alvarado Creek, Alvarado Road, or utilities would be constructed. The existing RV resort would remain as well as other existing conditions.

ES.4.2 Reduced Density Alternative

The Reduced Density Alternative would involve a similar development proposal to the project, but with a 25 percent reduction in the number of residential units. Specifically, this alternative considers the development of 712 multi-family residential units along with up to 15,000 square feet (SF) of resident-serving commercial space. The public improvements to Alvarado Creek, Alvarado Road, and

utility facilities proposed as part of the project also would occur under this alternative. Under this alternative, the development footprint and number of buildings would be the same as the project; however, buildings would include fewer floors of residential built on the podium.

ES.4.3 Phase 1 Only Alternative

The Phase 1 Only Alternative would involve a similar development proposal to the project, as only Phase 1 would be developed on the project site. Under this alternative, the portion of the site west of Alvarado Creek would be developed with three buildings that would include up to 645 multi-family residential units along with some resident-serving commercial space. The buildings would be the same as those of the project in terms of size, area, number of units, design, location, etc. The total area of the commercial space would be slightly less than the 15,000 SF associated with the project since three buildings would be constructed instead of four. The public improvements to Alvarado Creek, Alvarado Road, and utility facilities proposed as part of the project also would occur under this alternative. The eastern portion of the project site would not be redeveloped, and the existing RV resort would continue to operate in this portion of the site.

ES.4.4 Environmentally Superior Alternative

Section 15126.6(e)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines requires an EIR to identify the environmentally superior alternative. The guidelines also require that if the No Project Alternative is identified as the environmentally superior alternative, another environmentally superior alternative must be identified. Based on a comparison of the alternatives' overall environmental impacts and their compatibility with the proposed project's goals and objectives, the Reduced Density Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative for this PEIR.

ES.5 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS

The PEIR addresses in detail potentially significant environmental impacts associated with the following issue areas:

- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural and Tribal Cultural Resources
- Geology and Soils
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use
- Noise
- Paleontological Resources
- Public Services and Facilities
- Public Utilities
- Transportation
- Visual Resources

Table ES-1, *Summary of Impacts and Proposed Mitigation*, is presented at the end of this section and summarizes the results of the environmental analysis including the potentially significant environmental impacts of the proposed project and proposed mitigation measures to reduce or avoid these impacts. Impacts and mitigation measures are organized by issue in Chapter 4, *Environmental Analysis*. Based on this analysis, implementation of the proposed project would result in potentially significant impacts associated with the following issues:

- Biological Resources (sensitive species and nesting birds, sensitive vegetation, jurisdictional waters and wetlands, and consistency with habitat conservation plans);

- Cultural and Tribal Cultural Resources (unknown archaeological and tribal cultural resources);
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials (potential release of hazardous building materials during project construction); and
- Paleontological Resources (unknown paleontological resources).

The proposed project would not result in any significant and unavoidable environmental impacts. Mitigation measures have been identified that would reduce potentially significant environmental impacts to below a level of significance.

The cumulative impact analysis determines whether the proposed project's incremental effect would be "cumulatively considerable" when viewed in connection with the effects of past, present, or probable future projects. Table ES-2, *Summary of Cumulative Impacts*, is presented at the end of this section and identifies the potentially significant cumulative impacts of the proposed project to which the proposed project may contribute and proposed mitigation measures to reduce or avoid these impacts, as discussed in detail in Chapter 5, *Cumulative Impacts*, of this PEIR.

The project would not result in potentially significant impacts with respect to Agriculture and Forestry Resources, Energy, Mineral Resources, Population and Housing, and Wildfire, as described in Section 6.1, *Effects Found Not to be Significant*, of this PEIR.

**Table ES-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND PROPOSED MITIGATION**

Environmental Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
AIR QUALITY				
Quality Plans: <i>Would the project conflict with or obstruct the implementation of the applicable air quality plan?</i>	Although the project would increase population density over what was considered in the Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS), it would result in vehicle miles traveled (VMT) per capita that would be below the region-wide average, which would overall reduce vehicular air pollutant emissions consistent with regional goals such as SANDAG's Regional Plan, Senate Bill (SB) 743, and the City's General Plan. Therefore, the project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the RAQS.	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
Air Quality Standards: <i>Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?</i>	The project's construction and operational emissions of criteria pollutant and precursors would be below the San Diego Air Pollution Control District's screening-level thresholds. Therefore, the project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of criteria pollutants that would violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
Sensitive Receptors: <i>Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</i>	<p>Construction of the project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial concentrations of toxic air contaminants (TACs), including diesel particulate matter (DPM). The project also would not result in the exposure of on-site sensitive receptors (i.e., future project residents) to substantial concentrations of DPM.</p> <p>Although project construction may require the demolition or renovation of existing structures constructed prior to 1979, which could result in the disturbance of asbestos containing materials (ACMs) and lead-based paint (LBP), compliance with established regulations would ensure that potential air quality impacts associated with exposure to ACMs and LBP would be less than significant.</p>	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant

**Table ES-1 (cont.)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND PROPOSED MITIGATION**

Environmental Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
AIR QUALITY (cont.)				
	The proposed project would not result in a carbon monoxide (CO) hotspot or the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial, project-generated, localized CO emissions.			
Odors: <i>Would the project result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?</i>	Potential construction-generated odors would be localized, temporary, intermittent, and not expected to affect a substantial number of people. The proposed project would not introduce land uses that would generate substantial odor during operations.	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES				
Sensitive Species: <i>Would the project have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the CDFW or USFWS?</i>	Potentially significant impacts to sensitive species (Cooper's hawk and other raptor species) and nesting birds could result from the proposed project.	Potentially significant	Mitigation Measure BIO-1 as identified in Section 4.2.6.1	Less than significant
Sensitive Habitats: <i>Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the CDFW or USFWS?</i>	No permanent impacts to sensitive vegetation communities would occur. Implementation of the proposed project would result in temporary impacts to two sensitive vegetation communities, including freshwater marsh (0.04 acre) and willow woodland (0.01 acre).	Potentially significant	Mitigation Measure BIO-2 as identified in Section 4.2.6.2	Less than significant
Jurisdictional Waters and Wetlands: <i>Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?</i>	Implementation of the proposed project would result in permanent impacts to 0.03 acre of federal jurisdictional waters and 0.09 acre of state jurisdictional waters. Temporary impacts would occur to 0.06 acre of federal waters and 0.23 acre of state waters.	Potentially significant	Mitigation Measure BIO-3 as identified in Section 4.2.6.3	Less than significant

**Table ES-1 (cont.)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND PROPOSED MITIGATION**

Environmental Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES (cont.)				
<p>Wildlife Movement: <i>Would the project interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?</i></p>	<p>Alvarado Creek functions as a local wildlife corridor. However, the portion of Alvarado Creek within and adjacent to the project site is not considered a regional wildlife corridor because although it may function for some local wildlife movement, the project site and surrounding areas are developed such that this reach of the creek does not serve as a habitat linkage to off-site wildlife corridors or large native habitat areas. Consequently, the proposed project would not substantially interfere with wildlife movement within this local wildlife corridor.</p> <p>No known or potential wildlife nursery sites occur on, or in the immediate vicinity, of the project site. As a result, the project would not impede the use of a native wildlife nursery site.</p>	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
<p>Biological Resources Protection and Ordinances: <i>Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</i></p>	<p>The proposed project would not conflict with applicable goals, objectives, and policies within the General Plan Conservation and Sustainability Element or Recreation and Open Space Element. The project would minimize impacts to sensitive biological resources and Alvarado Creek would be revegetated with native riparian vegetation, which would provide for improved biological habitat and resources. New trees, ornamental landscaping, and native riparian vegetation would be planted as part of the comprehensive landscape plan for the project. New trees would be planted in accordance with the City's Tree Policy Manual, which provides a reference for existing guidelines, policies, and standards for the planting, care, preservation, maintenance, and replacement of trees. In addition, project implementation would not impact the City's habitat preserve area as identified in the La Mesa Subarea Habitat</p>	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant

**Table ES-1 (cont.)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND PROPOSED MITIGATION**

Environmental Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES (cont.)				
	Conservation Plan (HCP)/Natural Community Conservation Plan (NCCP). Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources.			
Habitat Conservation Plans: <i>Would the project conflict with the provisions of an adopted HCP, NCCP, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?</i>	<p>The project site is located within the boundaries of the City of La Mesa Subarea HCP/NCCP, but not within or in the vicinity of areas designated as Multi-Habitat Planning Area, Core Biological Resource Areas and Linkages, or other preserve lands as identified in the Subarea HCP/NCCP.</p> <p>Although the project site is located within a highly developed area of the City, there are trees throughout the site and riparian habitat along Alvarado Creek that could potentially support sensitive species (Cooper’s hawk within trees and least Bell’s vireo within riparian habitat) protected by the Subarea Plan.</p>	Potentially significant	Mitigation Measure BIO-1 as identified in Section 4.2.6.1	Less than significant
CULTURAL AND TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES				
Historical Resources: <i>Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5?</i>	The existing on-site buildings and the San Diego RV Resort do not meet the California Register of Historic Resources (CRHR) or La Mesa Historic Landmark eligibility criteria and thus, is ineligible for listing on the CRHR and ineligible for designation as a City of La Mesa Historic Landmark. Accordingly, the property does not meet the definition of an historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines. Demolition and removal of the buildings, structures, and site features at the proposed property would not result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource.	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant

**Table ES-1 (cont.)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND PROPOSED MITIGATION**

Environmental Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
CULTURAL AND TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES (cont.)				
<p>Archaeological Resources: <i>Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5?</i></p>	<p>No recorded prehistoric archaeological resources are listed on the project site or within the one-half mile radius buffer. Additionally, no prehistoric archaeological resources were observed on or near the site during the field survey. The project site, however, is located within the Alvarado Creek floodplain and consequently, there is potential that unknown prehistoric material has been buried by streambed deposits from periodic flooding of the creek. It is possible that construction-related subsurface grading and trenching activities may uncover buried unknown archaeological resources. In the event that subsurface archaeological resources are encountered during construction, such resources could potentially be damaged or destroyed, resulting in a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource.</p>	Potentially significant	Mitigation Measure CUL-1 as identified in Section 4.3.6.2	Less than significant
<p>Tribal Cultural Resources: <i>Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in PRC section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:</i></p> <p>a. <i>Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in PRC Section 5020.1(k), or</i></p> <p>b. <i>A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria</i></p>	<p>Based on the Native American Heritage Commission Sacred Lands Files, South Coastal Information Center records search, field survey, and Native American outreach, no tribal cultural resources are known to occur in the project area. However, there is potential for unknown buried tribal cultural resources to be present given the site's location within the Alvarado Creek floodplain. Project construction could encounter unknown tribal cultural resources during subsurface grading and trenching activities that may have been buried by streambed deposits from periodic flooding of Alvarado Creek. If encountered, such resources could potentially be damaged or destroyed, resulting in a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource.</p>	Potentially significant	Mitigation Measure CUL-1 as identified in Section 4.3.6.2	Less than significant

**Table ES-1 (cont.)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND PROPOSED MITIGATION**

Environmental Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
CULTURAL AND TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES (cont.)				
<i>set forth in subdivision (c) of PRC Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of PRC Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.</i>				
GEOLOGY AND SOILS				
<p>Seismic Hazards: <i>Would the project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault; strong seismic ground shaking; seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction; or landslides?</i></p>	<p>The project site is not underlain by a known active or potentially active fault. Therefore, the potential for ground surface rupture is considered to be low and it is unlikely that implementation of the proposed project would directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving ground rupture.</p> <p>The project site could potentially be subject to relatively high levels of ground shaking and site acceleration in the event of an earthquake on any of the major active faults in the region. Proper engineering and adherence to the California Building Code (CBC) guidelines would minimize the risk to life and property from potential ground motion at the project site. Therefore, the project would not directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving ground shaking.</p> <p>The potential for liquefaction at the project site is minimal due to the dense nature of the underlying formational materials associated with the Stadium Conglomerate. Therefore, it is unlikely that implementation of the proposed project would expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects involving liquefaction.</p>	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant

**Table ES-1 (cont.)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND PROPOSED MITIGATION**

Environmental Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
GEOLOGY AND SOILS (cont.)				
	The project area is underlain by generally flat bedding and lacks steep slopes. The proposed project would follow the construction recommendations provided by the Geotechnical Investigation and CBC requirements, which would avoid potential slope failure and/or landslide hazards. Therefore, it is unlikely that implementation of the proposed project would expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects from seismic-induced landslides.			
Soil Erosion: <i>Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</i>	During project construction, erosion and sedimentation control best management practices (BMPs) would be implemented as part of the site-specific Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) developed pursuant to the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Construction General Permit and the City's Storm Water BMP Manual, which would minimize the effects of water erosion. Following construction of each phase, any remaining disturbed areas within that phase would be stabilized with landscaping to prevent erosion and topsoil loss.	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
Unstable Soils: <i>Would the project be located on a geological unit or soil that is unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on-site or off-site landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?</i>	The underlying formational materials (i.e., Stadium Conglomerate) would provide adequate support for the proposed structures and improvements. However, the existing artificial fill and stream deposits on the site within the first nine feet of depth are not considered suitable in their current condition to provide a stable soil base to support the proposed structures and improvements. Adherence to the recommendations contained in the Geotechnical Investigation, which will be required as project conditions of approval and incorporated into the construction contract specifications, would avoid impacts related to unstable soils.	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant

**Table ES-1 (cont.)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND PROPOSED MITIGATION**

Environmental Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
GEOLOGY AND SOILS (cont.)				
Expansive Soils: <i>Would the project be located on an expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?</i>	Soils at the project site are considered to have a very low to low expansion potential. Adherence to the recommendations contained in the Geotechnical Investigation, which will be required as project conditions of approval and incorporated into the construction contract specifications, would avoid impacts related to expansive soils.	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS				
Generation of Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions: <i>Would the project generate GHGs, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?</i>	The project's construction and operational GHG emissions would not exceed the City's GHG emissions target. Therefore, the project would not generate GHG emissions that may have a significant impact on the environment.	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
Conflicts with GHG Reduction Plans, Policies, or Regulations: <i>Would the project conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emission of GHGs?</i>	The project's estimated GHG emissions per capita would be below the City's GHG emissions per capita reduction target selected for the Climate Action Plan (CAP). Therefore, the project would be consistent with the reduction strategies and GHG emissions per capita target and would be consistent with the CAP. The project would implement transit-oriented development near the 70 th Street Trolley Station and reduce VMT per capita, consistent with SANDAG's Regional Plan. Therefore, the project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs.	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS				
Release of Hazardous Materials: <i>Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</i> <i>Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?</i>	Implementation of the proposed project could result in a potentially significant hazards impact during demolition activities associated with release of ACM and/or LBP.	Potentially significant	Mitigation Measure HAZ-1 as identified in Section 4.6.6.1	Less than significant

**Table ES-1 (cont.)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND PROPOSED MITIGATION**

Environmental Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS (cont.)				
Hazards to Schools: <i>Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</i>	Implementation of the proposed project could result in a potentially significant hazards impact to people at nearby schools during demolition activities associated with release of ACM and/or LBP.	Potentially significant	Mitigation Measure HAZ-1 as identified in Section 4.6.6.1	Less than significant
Listed Hazardous Materials Sites: <i>Would the project be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?</i>	Although the project site is identified on two hazardous materials databases, neither listing represents a recognized environmental condition at the project site. Additionally, there are no off-site listed facilities that would represent a recognized environmental condition to the project site. Therefore, the project site is not located on a listed hazardous materials site compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 that would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
Airport Safety Hazards: <i>For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?</i>	The project site is located within Airport Influence Area (AIA) Review Area 2 of the Montgomery-Gibbs Executive Airport but the proposed project would not include any structures that would exceed the Federal Air Regulations Part 77 height restrictions for the airspace protection area (200 feet) and thus, the project site would not be subject to safety hazards associated with Montgomery-Gibbs Executive Airport operations. Furthermore, due to the distance from the Grossmont Hospital heliport and the relatively low number of flights from this facility, the project site would not be subject to safety hazards associated with related heliport operations. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not result in airport safety hazards for people residing or working in the project area.	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant

**Table ES-1 (cont.)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND PROPOSED MITIGATION**

Environmental Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS (cont.)				
Emergency Response and Evacuation Plans: <i>Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</i>	Construction of the project could require temporary detours and/or lane closures that could temporarily disrupt travel along Alvarado Road for a period of time within the construction zone. Emergency access to all surrounding properties, however, would be maintained throughout the construction period. The project would provide adequate emergency access within the site. Therefore, implementation of the project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY				
Water Quality: <i>Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?</i>	Based on the implementation of the project design elements, construction and post-construction BMPs, related maintenance efforts, and required conformance with City storm water standards (including the NPDES Construction General, Municipal and Groundwater permits), the proposed project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality.	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
Groundwater: <i>Would the project substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?</i>	Project implementation would result in an approximately 10-percent increase in impervious surfaces over the existing condition but would not substantially interfere with groundwater recharge at the site since it is currently minimal given existing drainage patterns and characteristics. It is anticipated that during construction, dewatering would be required and permit from the Regional Water Quality Control Board would be required. The project does not propose the long-term use of groundwater.	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant

**Table ES-1 (cont.)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND PROPOSED MITIGATION**

Environmental Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY (cont.)				
<p>Drainage Pattern Alteration: <i>Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site; substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site; create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional resources of polluted runoff; or impede or redirect flood flows?</i></p>	<p>The proposed project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site, substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site, create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems, or provide substantial additional resources of polluted runoff or impeded or redirect flood flows.</p>	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
<p>Flood, Tsunami, and Seiche Zones: <i>Would the project, in flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?</i></p>	<p>The proposed improvements would fully contain the 100-year flow within the Alvarado Creek channel, with no adverse impacts to the water surface elevations upstream of the project site. Additionally, the proposed on-site storm drain system for the project has been designed with sufficient capacity to convey the 100-year storm event without causing flooding of the proposed streets and development.</p> <p>Due to the distance from the ocean and high elevation, the project site would not be subject to inundation by tsunami.</p> <p>The project site would not be subject to inundation by seiche due to the distance from local water bodies.</p>	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant

**Table ES-1 (cont.)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND PROPOSED MITIGATION**

Environmental Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY (cont.)				
Water Quality Plans: <i>Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?</i>	The proposed project would implement a site-specific SWPPP pursuant to the NPDES Construction General Permit and the City's Storm Water BMP Manual and would adhere to applicable requirements outlined in the project Storm Water Quality Management Plan. The project would also comply with all storm water quality standards during construction and operation. Conformance with the Water Quality Control Plan for the San Diego Basin (Basin Plan) water quality objectives would be demonstrated through compliance with applicable regulations and implementation of construction and post-construction BMPs. Thus, the project would be consistent with the Basin Plan.	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
LAND USE				
Community Division: <i>Would the project physically divide an established community?</i>	The project would not introduce any new roads or other linear features that would create new or exacerbate existing physical barriers. The project would improve mobility and connectivity within the project area. Consequently, the proposed project would reduce the amount of division that exists in the project area by improving walkability and bicycle opportunities within the project area and near the 70 th Street Trolley Station. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not physically divide an established community.	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
Consistency with Environmental Policies of Adopted Land Use Plans: <i>Would the project cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?</i>	The proposed project would be consistent with existing applicable local and regional land use plans, policies, and regulations, including San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan, La Mesa General Plan, La Mesa Zoning Ordinance, Climate Action Plan, Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan for Montgomery-Gibbs Executive Airport, Regional Air Quality Strategy, and the Water Quality Control Plan for the San Diego Basin. Therefore, the project would not cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant

**Table ES-1 (cont.)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND PROPOSED MITIGATION**

Environmental Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
NOISE				
<p>Noise Standards: <i>Would the project result in generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?</i></p>	<p>During project construction, nearby properties would likely be exposed to construction noise levels that could be heard above ambient conditions; however, the exposure would be temporary and would not be considered adverse. The project would comply with all applicable noise regulations related to construction noise, minimizing potential impacts related to noise generation during construction.</p> <p>The project site would experience noise from vehicle traffic on I-8 and Alvarado Road, in addition to noise from trolley traffic on the adjacent trolley corridor. Such noise may exceed the applicable thresholds outlined in City's General Plan; however, the project would incorporate noise reduction design features that have been incorporated into the project design, which would reduce on-site noise levels from traffic to acceptable levels.</p> <p>Although the project would contribute to an increase in traffic volumes along Alvarado Road, ambient noise increases would be anticipated to be less than three dBA. Therefore, the project would not result in a substantial increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project such that noise levels at nearby noise-sensitive land uses would exceed applicable noise standards.</p> <p>Noise sources on the project site during project operation would not exceed the La Mesa Municipal Code noise limits at adjacent properties or result in a substantial permanent increase in existing noise levels.</p>	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant

**Table ES-1 (cont.)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND PROPOSED MITIGATION**

Environmental Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
NOISE (cont.)				
Vibration: <i>Would the project result in generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?</i>	Project residents would not be exposed to excessive groundborne vibration or noise levels from the trolley corridor that would exceed applicable Federal Transit Administration (FTA) vibration thresholds. The project would not generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels during construction that would exceed applicable FTA vibration thresholds at nearby vibration-sensitive land uses.	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
Airport Noise: <i>For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</i>	The project site is not located within the 60 dBA Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) noise contour of the nearest airports, specifically Gillespie Field, Montgomery-Gibbs Executive Airport, or MCAS Miramar. Additionally, the nearest heliport, located at Grossmont Hospital, includes five to ten flights every month, which is not enough to generate noise levels above 60 CNEL at the project site. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels generated by airports.	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES				
Paleontological Resources: <i>Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?</i>	Geological formations within the project site include a shallow layer of fill, stream deposits, and the Stadium Conglomerate Formation. While there is no potential for paleontological resources to exist within the fill material, the stream deposits have a low to moderate potential for resources and the Stadium Conglomerate Formation is assigned a high paleontological resource sensitivity rating. Thus, ground disturbing activities associated with construction of the project have the potential to uncover and potentially damage or destroy paleontological resources.	Potentially significant	Mitigation Measure PAL-1 as identified in Section 4.10.6	Less than significant

**Table ES-1 (cont.)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND PROPOSED MITIGATION**

Environmental Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
PUBLIC FACILITIES AND SERVICES				
<p>Public Facilities: <i>Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>fire protection;</i> • <i>police protection;</i> • <i>schools;</i> • <i>parks; or</i> • <i>other public facilities?</i> 	<p>The project would increase the demand for public facilities and services, such as fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, and other public facilities. Heartland Fire and the La Mesa Police Department have the capacity and capability to provide service to the project. Additionally, the three schools designated to serve the project are not operating at full capacity. Further, the project would be subject to school facilities fees, which would serve as mitigation to any project-related impacts to school facilities. Similarly, the project would submit park development fees to minimize impacts related to parks. Implementation of the project would not cause a substantial change or increased demand for additional library services, and the additional project residents would not substantially increase the demand for other public facilities within the City (such as the community center, recreation center, municipal pool, baseball field, and Adult Enrichment Center) such that new or expanded facilities would be required as a result of the project. Implementation of the project therefore would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered public facilities.</p>	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
<p>Deterioration of Existing Neighborhood Parks and Recreational Facilities: <i>Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?</i></p>	<p>The project would increase the demand for use of existing public parks and recreational facilities in the project area, which could potentially result in physical deterioration of such facilities. However, the project would be required to pay a parkland improvement fee pursuant to Municipal Code Section 9.20.040 and 9.20.050. With payment of a parkland improvement fee, the project would not increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated.</p>	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant

**Table ES-1 (cont.)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND PROPOSED MITIGATION**

Environmental Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
PUBLIC FACILITIES AND SERVICES (cont.)				
Construction or Expansion of Recreational Facilities: <i>Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?</i>	<p>The project would include on-site recreational amenities for project residents. The environmental effects resulting from implementation of the proposed on-site recreational amenities are evaluated in this PEIR and where potential adverse physical effects could occur, mitigation is identified that would reduce impacts to below a level of significance. The project would contribute to the existing citywide need for additional park and recreational facilities but would require payment of a parkland improvement fee pursuant to Municipal Code Section 9.20.040 and 9.20.050 to offset the impact of new development on the City's existing facilities and infrastructure. Payment of a parkland improvement fee would not result in physical effects on the environment.</p>	Less than significant	No additional measures required	Less than significant
PUBLIC UTILITIES				
Utilities: <i>Would the project require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?</i>	<p>The project would not result in the need for new or expanded water facilities. The project proposes some sewer line relocations and improvements within and adjacent to the project site; however, the improvements would not result in environmental effects aside from those outlined in this PEIR. Further, based on the estimated project flows combined with both existing flows and subsequent developments, the existing and proposed sewer systems would have capacity to serve the project, and the project would not substantially contribute to, or exacerbate existing downstream sewer system capacity impacts.</p> <p>The project would involve the construction of new storm water drainage facilities within the project site; however, the proposed facilities would connect to the existing municipal storm drain system, the capacity of which would not be adversely affected by the project.</p>	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant

**Table ES-1 (cont.)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND PROPOSED MITIGATION**

Environmental Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
PUBLIC UTILITIES (cont.)				
	The project would involve the relocation of the existing overhead power lines and telecommunications utility lines to underground. Relocation of such utilities would not result in environmental effects aside from those outlined in this PEIR. Additionally, the existing electric power distribution system and telecommunications distribution system would have adequate capacity to serve the project. Further, the project would connect to existing gas lines and would not adversely affect the capacity of the existing gas distribution system.			
Water Supply: <i>Would the project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?</i>	The project is consistent with the water demands assumptions included in the regional water resource planning documents of Helix Water District (HWD), San Diego County Water Authority (Water Authority), and The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (MWD). Current and future water supplies, as well as the actions necessary to develop these supplies, have been identified in the water resources planning documents of HWD, Water Authority, and MWD to serve the projected demands of the Specific Plan area, in addition to the existing and planned future water demands of HWD.	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
Wastewater: <i>Would the project result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?</i>	The project would increase wastewater generation at the site. However, the project's increase would represent less than one percent of the remaining capacity at the project's wastewater treatment provider, the Point Loma Wastewater Treatment Plant (WTP). Therefore, the Point Loma WTP has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to its existing commitments.	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant

**Table ES-1 (cont.)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND PROPOSED MITIGATION**

Environmental Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
PUBLIC UTILITIES (cont.)				
<p>Solid Waste Management: <i>Would the project generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?</i></p> <p><i>Would the project comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</i></p>	<p>The project would divert a minimum of 75 percent of waste during project construction and operation, thereby adhering to the requirements in Title 14.27 of the City's Municipal Code and Assembly Bill (AB) 341. The project would also provide areas for storage and collection of recyclables and yard waste in accordance with 2019 Title 24 Part 11 California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen) Standards. Following such standards would ensure that the project would also comply with Title 7.22 of the City's Municipal Code and AB 939.</p> <p>The project site would be serviced by EDCO, which would have sufficient landfill capacity to accommodate project waste for at least the next 15 years. Therefore, the project would not generate solid waste in excess of state or local standards or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals. It would also comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste.</p>	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
TRANSPORTATION				
<p>Transportation Plans: <i>Would the project conflict with a program plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?</i></p>	<p>The proposed project would be consistent with applicable transportation plans, including San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan, the Circulation Element of the General Plan, and the City of La Mesa Bicycle Facilities and Alternative Transportation Plan. Therefore, the project would not conflict with a program plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities.</p>	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant

**Table ES-1 (cont.)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND PROPOSED MITIGATION**

Environmental Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
TRANSPORTATION (cont.)				
Vehicle Miles Traveled: <i>Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?</i>	<p>The project is located within one half mile of an existing major transit stop, specifically the 70th Street Trolley Station, and is therefore presumed to have a less than significant impact on VMT per the Office of Planning and Research Technical Advisory screening thresholds.</p> <p>Although not required per the VMT screening threshold for proximity to transit, a VMT analysis was conducted for the project to determine whether it would exceed VMT thresholds. According to the VMT analysis prepared for the project, the VMT per capita resulting from the proposed project is 88 percent of the regional average, exceeding the 85 percent threshold for residential projects. However, the project would implement VMT reduction features including construction of a transit-oriented development and provision of pedestrian and bicycle facility improvements, which would reduce the project's VMT per capita to approximately 81 percent of the regionwide VMT per capita, meeting the 85 percent threshold. Therefore, the project would not conflict with or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b).</p>	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
Transportation Design Hazards: <i>Would the project substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?</i>	There would be no hazardous design features or incompatible uses introduced as a result of the project. The proposed shared-use path would be constructed as a Class I facility, which would provide a buffered facility dedicated for bicyclists and pedestrians. Roadway improvements would conform with applicable federal, State, and City design criteria which contain provisions to minimize transportation hazards. Further, the proposed uses are not anticipated to generate the types of traffic that would be incompatible with the existing transportation network. Therefore, the project would not substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature or incompatible uses.	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant

**Table ES-1 (cont.)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND PROPOSED MITIGATION**

Environmental Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
TRANSPORTATION (cont.)				
Emergency Access: <i>Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?</i>	Emergency access to all surrounding properties would be maintained throughout the construction period, ensuring adequate emergency access during construction. The project would construct improvements to Alvarado Road, which would improve emergency access to the project site and surrounding areas. Within the project site, access for emergency vehicles would be provided along the proposed perimeter road, and fire lanes would be provided on site to accommodate emergency response vehicles such that Alvarado Road would not be obstructed for public safety vehicle movement as well as local traffic both to the east and west in the event of an emergency. Therefore, the project would not result in inadequate emergency access.	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
VISUAL RESOURCES				
Scenic Vistas: <i>Would the project have a substantial effect on a scenic vista?</i>	<p>No scenic vistas or panoramic views identified by the City's General Plan are located within the project vicinity, and the project site is not visible from any of them except for Mount Helix. However, the project would not adversely affect views from Mount Helix due to the distance from this scenic vista.</p> <p>The project site is also not located within the Scenic Preservation Overlay Zone, Hillside Overlay Zone, or other identified visually sensitive areas. Additionally, the project site does not contain any features that would be part of a scenic vista, nor does it provide any expansive views of notable regional landforms. Further, the limited views of Cowles Mountain from the project site would be maintained.</p>	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant

**Table ES-1 (cont.)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND PROPOSED MITIGATION**

Environmental Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
VISUAL RESOURCES (cont.)				
<p>Scenic Resources: <i>Would the project substantially damage scenic resources, including but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?</i></p>	<p>The project site is not visible from an officially designated state scenic highway, and therefore would not substantially damage scenic resources within a designated state scenic highway. The project would result in the loss of 155 Mexican fan palms that are identified as a scenic resource, specifically a landmark in the City's General Plan. However, the trees are not a unique or distinctive landmark, as palm trees are common in the region. Additionally, the project would create a scenic resource through the enhancement and restoration of Alvarado Creek as it traverses through the project site. Overall, project implementation would not substantially damage scenic resources or protected views and scenic resources within a state scenic highway.</p>	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
<p>Visual Character and Quality: <i>Would the project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point)? If the project is in an urbanized area, conflict with an applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality.</i></p>	<p>The project would not result in a substantial change to existing landforms. The proposed development would be consistent with the development patterns in the surrounding area, and would not introduce a new land use or new type of building form that does not currently exist in the immediate area. Although the project would be at a greater scale than surrounding development, the design and configuration of buildings and landscaping would reduce massing effects. The project site is located in an urbanized area that is identified as suitable for redevelopment with higher development intensities. Additionally, the visual quality from public viewpoints would be increased based on the added visual interest and increased visual unity, vividness, and intactness. Further, the project would be consistent with applicable scenic quality goals, objectives, and policies. For these reasons, the project would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings.</p>	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant

**Table ES-1 (cont.)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND PROPOSED MITIGATION**

Environmental Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
VISUAL RESOURCES (cont.)				
Light and Glare: <i>Would the project create new source of substantial light and glare, which would adversely affect day and nighttime views in the area?</i>	The net increase in nighttime lighting resulting from the project would not be considered substantial on a citywide or regional scale due to the urbanized nature of the site and surrounding area. Additionally, exterior lighting would adhere to the design guidelines in the proposed Specific Plan, and the project would not include large expanses of reflective material or surfaces such as glass or metal. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a significant impact related to new sources of light and glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views on the area.	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant

**Table ES-2
SUMMARY OF CUMULATIVE IMPACTS**

Environmental Issue	Geographic Scope of Cumulative Analysis	Significance of Cumulative Impact	Project Contribution
Air Quality	San Diego Air Basin	Less than significant	Not cumulatively considerable
Biological Resources	La Mesa Subarea Habitat Conservation Plan/Natural Community Conservation Plan study area	Less than significant with Mitigation Measures BIO-1, BIO-2, and BIO-3	Not cumulatively considerable
Cultural and Tribal Cultural Resources	City of La Mesa and immediately surrounding lands; San Diego region	Less than significant with Mitigation Measure CUL-1	Not cumulatively considerable
Geology and Soils	City of La Mesa and immediately surrounding lands	Less than significant	Not cumulatively considerable
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Global	Less than significant	Not cumulatively considerable
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	Project site and adjacent properties (hazardous materials); AIA of Montgomery-Gibbs Executive Airport (airport safety hazards); City of La Mesa and immediately surrounding areas (emergency response and evacuation plans)	Less than significant	Not cumulatively considerable
Hydrology and Water Quality	San Diego Hydrologic Unit	Less than significant	Not cumulatively considerable
Land Use	City of La Mesa	Less than significant	Not cumulatively considerable
Noise	Area immediately surrounding the project site and roadways that would be used by resident vehicles	Less than significant	Not cumulatively considerable
Paleontological Resources	Coastal plain of San Diego County	Less than significant with Mitigation Measure PAL-1	Not cumulatively considerable
Public Facilities and Services	City of La Mesa and immediately surrounding areas	Less than significant	Not cumulatively considerable
Public Utilities	La Mesa region	Less than significant	Not cumulatively considerable
Transportation	City of La Mesa and immediate surrounding areas	Less than significant	Not cumulatively considerable
Visual Resources	Viewshed of the proposed project	Less than significant	Not cumulatively considerable