Initial Study for the Westfield North County Theater Project

1. Project Title:	Westfield North County Theater Project
2. Lead Agency:	City of Escondido Community Development Department Planning Division 201 N. Broadway, First Fl. Escondido, CA 92025
3. Contact Person and Address:	Bill Martin City of Escondido Community Development Department Planning Division 201 N. Broadway, First Fl. Escondido, CA 92025
4. Project Location:	Westfield North County Regional Shopping Center 272 E. Via Rancho Parkway Escondido, CA 92025
5. Project Applicant's Name and Address:	Westfield, LLC 225 Broadway, Ste. 1700 San Diego, CA 92101
6. Prepared By: Name and Address:	Eyestone Environmental 6701 Center Drive West, Suite 900 Los Angeles, CA 90045 (424) 207-5333
7. General Plan Designation:	Planned Commercial
8. Zoning:	Planned Development—Commercial (PD-C)

9. Project Background and Description:

Westfield, LLC proposes to improve the existing Westfield North County Regional Shopping Center located on an approximately 83-acre, irregularly shaped site in the City of Escondido. The Project Site is currently comprised of a three-story, enclosed regional shopping mall containing retail and restaurant uses, and four stand-alone restaurant pad buildings. Proposed improvements to the shopping center would occur within the boundaries of the Development Area, which is defined as the existing surface parking area located in the northern portion of the Project Site. The Project would include the construction of a 50,341-square-foot theater with approximately 10 screens and 1,248 seats, the construction of a new outdoor pedestrian plaza between the existing shopping mall and the proposed theater, and modification of the current Master Sign Program to allow for new signage on the Project Site. Project buildout would result in a total gross leasable area (GLA) of 1,329,826 square feet at the Westfield North County Regional Shopping Center.

10. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

The Westfield North County Shopping Center is located adjacent to the City of Escondido's southern boundary. More specifically, the Project Site is located north of Via Rancho Parkway, east of Interstate 15 (I-15), south of Beethoven Drive, and west of Bear Valley Parkway. The Development Area is a 1.25-acre surface parking area within the eastern portion of the 83-acre Project Site. The Development Area is surrounded by surface parking areas on the northwest and southeast and the shopping mall structure on the southwest. The northeast boundary of the Development Area runs parallel to Beethoven Drive.

Regional access to the Project Site is provided via I-15, which is located approximately 1,500 feet west of the Project Site and runs in a north-south direction, and State Route 78 (SR-78), which is located approximately 4.25 miles north of the Project Site and runs in an east-west direction. Local access to the Project Site is provided by a network of streets, including Via Rancho Parkway, Bear Valley Parkway, Beethoven Drive, and San Pasqual Road, as shown in Figure A-2 in Attachment A, Project Description, of this MND.

Existing uses surrounding the Project Site include the Kit Carson Park to the north and northeast; the Escondido Golf Course to the east; the San Dieguito River Park, various retail and commercial uses, and open space to the south; and I-15 followed by a commercial shopping center and residential uses to the west.

11. Discretionary Approvals:

Approvals required for Project development would include, but not be limited to, the following:

- Approval of a modification to the Master Development Plan for the overall site development guidelines and new, site-related improvements. Changes to the Master Sign Program will occur as part of the modification to the Master Development Plan Application.

- Approval of a Precise Development Plan for the new, building-related improvements.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

☐ Aesthetics	☐ Agriculture and Forestry Resources	☐ Air Quality
☐ Biological Resources	☐ Cultural Resources	☐ Geology and Soils
☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions	☐ Hazards and Hazardous Materials	☐ Hydrology and Water Quality
☐ Land Use and Planning	☐ Mineral Resources	☐ Noise
☐ Paleontological Resources	☐ Population and Housing	☐ Public Services
☐ Recreation	☐ Transportation and Traffic	☐ Tribal Cultural Resources
☐ Utilities and Service Systems	☐ Mandatory Findings of Significance	

DETERMINATION (To be completed by Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.	
I find that, although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described on an attached sheet have been added to the project. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.	**X**
I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.	
I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.	
I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.	

Signature

Date

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS. (Explanations for all answers are required):

1. AESTHETICS. Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Less Than Significant Impact. For purposes of CEQA, a scenic vista is generally defined as a viewpoint that provides expansive views of a highly valued landscape for the benefit of the general public. The Project would result in a significant impact if it would obstruct, interrupt, or detract from a scenic vista that is visible from a public viewpoint, such as a roadway, recreational area, designated trail or scenic vista or highway.[1] According to the General Plan Update EIR, the Project is within the Westfield Shoppingtown Target Area, which is characterized by a multi-story regional shopping center with several anchor tenants, smaller shops and free-standing upscale dining establishments. This area is a gateway into the City and clearly visible from I-15.[2] Per the General Plan Update EIR, visual resources within Project area include the Kit Carson Park, located immediately northeast of the Development Area, and the scenic vistas of the hillsides and ridgelines to the north, east, and west of the Project area. In addition, the City has identified several scenic roadways in the General Plan Update, including I-15 and the segments of Via Rancho Parkway and Bear Valley Parkway adjacent to the Project Site. The City defines the I-15 scenic corridor as the area within 1,750 feet of the freeway. The Project Site is located approximately 1,500 feet west of I-15 and thus is within the I-15 scenic corridor.[3]

The Project involves the construction of a new theater building, an outdoor pedestrian plaza, and Project signage. The Project is consistent with the existing General Plan land use and zoning designations for the Project Site. The proposed theater would have a maximum height of approximately 48 feet, which is lower than the maximum 70-foot height of the existing shopping center structure.[4] The Project would also include the modification of the current Master Sign Program to allow for the placement of a 28-foot tall pylon sign near the corner of

---

[1] *City of Escondido General Plan Update, Downtown Specific Plan Update, and Climate Action Plan Environmental Impact Report, Volume I—Final Environmental Impact Report, April 23, 2012, SCH# 2010071064 Page 4.1-20. www.escondido.org/Data/Sites/1/media/PDFs/Planning/GPUpdate/Vol1Cover.pdf, Accessed August 7, 2015*

[2] *Ibid., Page 4.1-12.*

[3] *Ibid., Section 4.1 Aesthetics.*

[4] *Height measurements are relative to the floor elevation of the entry lobby unless otherwise noted.*

Beethoven Drive and Bear Valley Parkway, The proposed pylon sign would be consistent with the signage of the shopping center and would be lower than the existing pylon sign located in the western portion of the Project Site adjacent to the I-15. Although the Development Area may be visible from I-15 and certain segments of Via Rancho Parkway and Bear Valley Parkway adjacent to the Project Site, the Project would not significantly alter or obstruct views of visual resources. Therefore, the Project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Less Than Significant Impact. There are no designated or eligible State scenic highways within the City of Escondido.[5] However, the City has identified several scenic roadways in its General Plan Update, including I-15 and the segments of Via Rancho Parkway and Bear Valley Parkway adjacent to the Project Site. The Project Site is characterized by the existing shopping center and associated surface parking areas and landscaping. The Development Area, which is located within a 1.25-acre surface parking area, includes limited ornamental trees and landscaping. There are no historic buildings or unique geologic or topographic features, such as hilltops, ridges, hillslopes, canyons, ravines, rock outcrops, water bodies, streambeds, or wetlands, located on the Project Site or specifically within the Development Area. As such, scenic resources do not exist on-site. Therefore, Project construction and operation would not result in impacts to scenic resources within any scenic highway. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Less Than Significant Impact. According to the General Plan Update EIR, degradation of existing visual character or quality occurs when new features or land uses

[5] *California Department of Transportation, California Scenic Highway Mapping System, 2013.*

detract from or contrast with important existing visual elements that enhance the character of or define an area, or by being inconsistent with applicable design guidelines.[6] As discussed above, the Project Site is located within the Westfield Shoppingtown Target Area, which consists of a multi-story regional shopping center with several anchor tenants, smaller shops and free-standing upscale dining establishments. The site is characterized by the massive shopping center structure, with its articulated façades, varied roofline, and building height of up to 70 feet, and expansive surface parking areas and associated landscaping. The 1.25-acre Development Area includes surface parking, limited ornamental trees, and landscaping. The visual character of the surrounding Project area is generally suburban and commercial to the west and north, and open space to the east and southeast, with major roadways and associated infrastructure, including I-15, bordering the Project Site.

The Project involves the removal of surface parking and associated landscaping within the Development Area and construction of a new theater building, outdoor pedestrian plaza, and Project signage. Construction activities would alter the visual quality of the Development Area; however, such activities would be temporary in nature and would not permanently alter the site's visual character.

While judgments in visual character inherently involve a degree of subjectivity, the existing parking area to be replaced may be considered by many as visually unappealing. As such, the introduction of a well-designed theater structure and outdoor pedestrian plaza, with a building height lower than that of the existing shopping center and a compatible architectural style, would be considered a visual improvement. The Project would be required to comply with applicable design guidelines for the Westfield North County Regional Shopping Center. Project signage also would comply with the Master Sign Program for the Project Site. Although the proposed pylon sign would be 28 feet tall, it would be lower than the existing pylon sign located in the western portion of the Project Site adjacent to the I-15 and would be consistent with the overall character of the shopping center. The proposed landscape design would involve the use of native, drought-tolerant plants that match and blend with the existing landscaping on-site. Further, all proposed landscaping would comply with the City of Escondido's Landscape Standards. The proposed use and design of the Project is typical of an urban shopping center and would be consistent with the overall visual character of the Project Site. Therefore, the Project would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

---

[6] *City of Escondido General Plan Update, Downtown Specific Plan Update, and Climate Action Plan Environmental Impact Report, Volume I – Final Environmental Impact Report, April 23, 2012, Page 4.1-29*

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project Site is characterized by moderate existing light levels primarily associated with pole mounted light fixtures throughout the surface parking areas, headlights from vehicles, and lighting along adjacent roadways. The Project would introduce new artificial lighting to the Project Site, such as low-level exterior lights adjacent to buildings and along pathways for aesthetic, security, and wayfinding purposes. Project lighting would comply with current energy standards and codes while providing appropriate light levels for safety, accent signage, architectural features, and landscaping elements. Light sources would be shielded and/or directed toward areas to be illuminated thereby minimizing spill-over. Project lighting would be typical of that found at urban shopping centers and would be consistent with the existing lighting conditions on-site. Thus, potential impacts associated with lighting would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

Glare is caused by the reflection of sunlight or artificial light from highly polished surfaces, such as window glass or reflective building materials. The largest source of existing glare is vehicles parked on-site. The Project may utilize a variety of building materials including precast concrete, terra cotta, stucco, aluminum, glass, tile, metal, and/or prefinished metal. Glass used in building façades would be non-reflective or treated with a non-reflective coating in order to minimize glare. Metal and prefinished building materials with the potential to cause glare would be used as accent materials and would not cover expansive spaces. Thus, the potential for building materials to cause glare would be minimized. Additionally, Project development would occur within an existing surface parking area, thus reducing the footprint of parking on-site. As such, impacts associated with glare would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

2. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES. In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	☐	☐	☐	☒

No Impact. The Project Site is located in an urbanized area of the City of Escondido and does not include any agricultural uses. In addition, neither the Project Site nor the surrounding area are identified as either prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of statewide importance in the California Resources Agency's Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. Therefore, development of the Project would not result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use. No impacts would occur, and no mitigation measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☐	☒

No Impact. The zoning designation for the Project Site is Planned Development—Commercial (PD-C). The Project Site is not zoned for agricultural use, and no agricultural zoning is present in the surrounding area. The Project Site and surrounding area also are not enrolled under a Williamson Act Contract. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural uses or a Williamson Act Contract. No impacts would occur, and no mitigation measures would be required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
c. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?	☐	☐	☐	☒

No Impact. The Project Site is located in an urbanized area and does not include any forest or timberland. As previously stated, the zoning designation for the Project Site is Planned Development – Commercial (PD-C). Accordingly, the Project Site is not zoned for or used as forest land. Therefore, the Project would not rezone forest land or timberland as defined by the Public Resources Code. No impacts would occur, and no mitigation measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to a non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	☒

No Impact. As stated above, the Project Site is not zoned for forest land and does not include any forest or timberland. Therefore, the Project would not result in the loss or conversion of forest land or timberland. No impacts would occur, and no mitigation measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
e. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	☒

No Impact. As noted above, the Project Site does not contain any agricultural or forest uses, nor are any agricultural or forest uses located in the Project vicinity. Thus, development of the Project would not convert any farmland or forest land to non-agricultural or non-forest use. No impacts would occur, and no mitigation measures are required.

3. AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

The following discussion is based in part on the Air Quality Worksheets provided as Appendix A of this Initial Study.

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project Site is located within the 4,260 square mile San Diego County Air Basin (Basin). The Basin is currently designated a non-attainment area for State 1-hour and State and federal 8-hour ozone (O_3) standards. Furthermore, the Basin is designated nonattainment for State standards for particulate matter less than 10 microns (PM_{10}) and particulate matter less than 2.5 microns ($PM_{2.5}$), but is in attainment or unclassified for all other air pollutants. As the Basin is designated nonattainment for the federal O_3 standard, the San Diego Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) was developed to identify feasible emission control measures and provide expeditious progress towards attaining the standards. The San Diego County Air Pollution Control District (SDCAPCD) is responsible for RAQS development and implementation.

The San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) is the regional planning agency for the San Diego region. With regard to future growth, SANDAG has prepared regional growth forecasts, the most current of which is Series 13: 2050 Regional Growth Forecast. The growth projections provided by SANDAG are based in part on projections originating under County and City General Plans. The growth projections are utilized in the preparation of the air quality forecasts and consistency analysis included in the RAQS.

As discussed in Response to Checklist Question 10.b, Land Use, below, because the Project is consistent with the land use designations in the City of Escondido's General Plan, the Project is also considered consistent with the region's RAQS. In addition, as discussed below, Project implementation would not exceed the City's established CEQA significance criteria for air quality in its Environmental Quality Regulations (EQR). Furthermore, the Project would be required to comply with all applicable rules and regulations established by SDAPCD (i.e., SDAPCD Rule 50 [Visible Emissions], Rule 51 [Nuisance], Rule 55 [Fugitive Dust], and Rule 67 [Architectural Coatings], etc.). Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not conflict with applicable air quality plans, and no mitigation measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Less Than Significant. As indicated above, the Project Site is located within the Basin, which has exceeded the State ambient air quality standards for O_3, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$, as well as the federal 8-hour O_3 standard. The Project would contribute to air pollutant emissions during construction (short-term) and Project occupancy (long-term). However, as demonstrated by the following analysis, construction and operation of the Project would result in less than significant impacts relative to the City's CEQA significance thresholds. Worksheets detailing this air quality analysis are included in Appendix A.

Construction

Construction emissions can vary substantially from day to day, depending on the level of activity, the specific type of operation and, for dust, the prevailing weather conditions. Construction of the Project has the potential to create regional and local air quality impacts through the use of heavy-duty construction equipment and through vehicle trips generated by construction workers traveling to and from the Project Site. In addition, fugitive dust emissions would result from demolition, site preparation, and construction activities. Mobile source emissions, primarily PM and nitrogen oxides (NO_X), would result from the use of construction equipment such as loaders, cranes, and haul trucks. During the finishing phase, paving operations and the application of architectural coatings (i.e., paints) and other building materials would release volatile organic compounds (VOCs).

Construction-related emissions associated with heavy construction equipment were calculated using the City's recommended California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod). Model results are provided in Appendix A. The calculations reflect the types and quantities of construction equipment that would be used to remove the existing pavement; grade and excavate the Project Site; construct the proposed structure; paving, and plant new landscaping within the Project Site. The analysis assumes that all construction activities would comply with SDCAPCD Rule 55 regarding the control of fugitive dust. An overview of the maximum daily emissions is presented in Table 1 on page 14, along with the significance thresholds for each air pollutant. As shown therein, maximum regional construction emissions would not exceed the thresholds for VOC, NO_X, carbon monoxide (CO), sulfur dioxide (SO_X), PM_{10}, or $PM_{2.5}$. Thus, potential impacts associated with construction emissions would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

Table 1
Unmitigated Construction Emissions[a]
(pounds per day)

Emission Source	VOC	NO_X	CO	$SO_{2.5}$	PM_{10}[b]	$PM_{2.5}$[b]
Pollutant Emissions						
Maximum Peak Daily	**28**	**70**	**48**	**<1**	**7**	**4**
Significance Threshold	75	250	550	250	100	55
Over/(Under)	(47)	(180)	(502)	(250)	(97)	(51)
Significant?	No	No	No	No	No	No

[a] *Compiled using the CalEEMod emissions inventory model. The equipment mix and use assumptions for each phase are provided in Appendix A.*
[b] *PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ emissions estimates are based on Compliance with SDAPCD Rule 55 requirements for fugitive dust suppression.*

Source: Eyestone Environmental, 2015.

Operations

The City has also established significance thresholds to evaluate potential impacts associated with the incremental increase in criteria air pollutants associated with long-term Project operations. Project operations could result in mobile source emissions as well as emissions generated by area sources (e.g., natural gas combustion, landscape fuel combustion, consumer products, and architectural coatings). Operational emissions related to the Project were evaluated using the CalEEMod model.

The Project would result in an increase in emissions from vehicular exhaust and the consumption of fossil fuels for heating and electricity generation for cooling, lighting, and power needs. The results of the detailed emissions calculations are provided in Table 2 on page 15, and CalEEMod output files are contained in Appendix A. As indicated therein, the Project would result in an increase of criteria pollutant emissions. However, the increase in emissions would be below the City's daily significance thresholds for long-term operations. Therefore, no impacts associated with operational emissions would occur, and no mitigation measures are required.

Neither the City nor SDAPCD provide guidelines for evaluating project-related localized CO impacts associated with traffic. Therefore, the South Coast Air Quality Management District's (SCAQMD's) guidelines were used for purposes of this analysis and would reflect a

Table 2
Maximum Incremental Increase in Project-Related Operational Emissions[a]
(pounds per day)

Emission Source	VOC	NO_X	CO	SO_X	PM_{10}	$PM_{2.5}$
Pollutant Emissions						
Area	1	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1
Energy	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1
Mobile	6	10	51	<1	7	2
Total Project Emissions	7	10	51	<1	7	2
Significance Threshold	55	250	550	250	100	55
Over/(Under)	(48)	(240)	(499)	(250)	(93)	(53)
Significant?	No	No	No	No	No	No

[a] *Compiled using the CalEEMod emissions inventory model. Model output files are provided in Appendix A of this Addendum.*

Source: Eyestone Environmental, 2015.

conservative approach for analysis of local CO impacts.[7] The SCAQMD recommends an evaluation of potential localized CO impacts when a project causes the level of service (LOS) at a study intersection to worsen from C to D, or if a project increases the volume-to-capacity (V/C) ratio at any intersection rated D or worse by two percent or more. None of the signalized intersections analyzed in the Traffic Study prepared by Gibson Transportation Consulting meet these requirements; therefore, no additional analysis of this issue is necessary.[8] Thus, the Project would not create new CO hotspots or exacerbate any existing CO hotspots. Impacts related to localized mobile-source CO emissions would not occur, and mitigation measures for operational air impacts are not required.

[7] *SCAQMD, Air Quality Analysis Handbook, www.aqmd.gov/home/regulations/ceqa/air-quality-analysis-handbook.*

[8] *Gibson Transportation Consulting, Inc., Transportation Study for the Westfield North County Theater Project, June 2015.*

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Less Than Significant Impact. The generation of daily construction and operational emissions associated with cumulative development could result in a cumulative significant impact associated with the cumulative net increase of O_3, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$ for which the region is in non-attainment. As discussed above, the proposed Project would be consistent with the RAQS, which is intended to bring the Basin into attainment for all criteria pollutants. In addition the daily emissions generated during construction and operation by the Project would not exceed the City's CEQA significance thresholds. Therefore, the Project's contribution to cumulative air quality impacts would be less than significant.

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Less Than Significant Impact. As shown in Figure A-1 in Attachment A, Project Description, of this MND, the Development Area is a 1.25-acre surface parking area within the eastern portion of the 83-acre Project Site. The Development Area is surrounded by surface parking areas on the northwest and southeast and the shopping mall structure on the southwest. The northeast boundary of the Development Area runs parallel to Beethoven Drive. Existing uses surrounding the Project Site include Kit Carson Park to the north and northeast; the Escondido Golf Course to the east; the San Dieguito River Park, various retail and commercial uses, and open space to the south; and I-15 followed by a commercial shopping center and residential uses to the west. The closest sensitive receptors are located within Kit Carson Park to the north and northeast, across Beethoven Drive.

As described in Response 3.b above, construction and operation of the Project would result in a less than significant impact when measured against the City's air quality significance thresholds. Therefore, the Project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. In addition, Project construction activities would comply with SDAPCD Rule 55 regarding the control of fugitive dust and other specified dust control

measures. As such, impacts to off-site sensitive receptors would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

When evaluating potential air quality impacts under CEQA, consideration is given to the location of sensitive receptors within close proximity of land uses that emit toxic air contaminants (TACs). The California Air Resources Board (CARB) has published and adopted the *Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Health Perspective (2005),* which provides recommendations regarding the siting of new sensitive land uses near potential sources of air toxic emissions (e.g., freeways, distribution centers, rail yards, ports, refineries, chrome plating facilities, dry cleaners, and gasoline dispensing facilities). The CARB guidelines recommend siting distances for both the development of sensitive land uses in proximity to TAC sources, and the addition of new TAC sources in proximity to existing sensitive land uses.

Although the Project would result in TAC emissions primarily from mobile source emissions (e.g., diesel particulate from delivery trucks), the Project would be consistent with the CARB guidance document discussed above and would not include any substantial TAC sources as defined in the guidance documents. Therefore, TAC impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Less Than Significant Impact. No objectionable odors are anticipated as a result of either construction or operation of the Project. The Project would be constructed using conventional building materials typical of construction projects of a similar type and size. Any odors that may be generated during construction would be localized, temporary in nature, and would not be sufficient to affect a substantial number of people or result in a nuisance as defined by SDAPCD Rule 51.

Land uses associated with odor complaints typically include agricultural uses, wastewater treatment plants, food processing plants, chemical plants, composting, refineries, landfills, dairies, and fiberglass molding. While the Project would not involve these types of uses, on-site trash receptacles used by the Project could have the potential to create odors. However, trash receptacles would be contained, and located and maintained in a manner to ensure odor control. Substantially adverse odor impacts due to the Project are not anticipated. Thus, impacts with regard to odors would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures would be required.

4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a. 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 California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☐	☐	☒

No Impact. The Project Site is located within an urbanized area and is currently developed as a regional shopping center with large surface parking areas. The Development Area, a 1.25-acre surface parking area, is located in the eastern portion of the Project Site and contains trees and ornamental landscaping typical of parking lots. No endangered and/or threatened species have been observed nor are any known to exist within the Development Area or the Project Site. Rather, the species that occur on-site are limited to small terrestrial and avian species typically found in urban settings. Furthermore, the Development Area and Project Site are highly developed and do not contain suitable habitat to support candidate, sensitive, or special status species. As such, the Project would not adversely affect endangered and/or threatened species either directly or indirectly through habitat modification. No impacts would occur, and no mitigation measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
b. 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 California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☐	☐	☒

No Impact. As stated above, the Development Area and Project Site are located within an urbanized area and currently developed as a regional shopping center with large surface parking areas. The Project Site does not contain any sensitive natural community, as designated by the City of Escondido, the County of San Diego, the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Furthermore, the Development Area and Project Site do not contain suitable habitat to support candidate, sensitive, or special

status species. Therefore, the Project would not result in a substantial adverse effect on riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities. No impacts would occur, and no mitigation measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	☐	☐	☐	☒

No Impact. No federally protected waters or wetlands, as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, are present within the Development Area or the Project Site. The Project Site is fully developed with an existing shopping center site and surface parking areas. No impacts would occur, and no mitigation measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
d. 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?	☐	☒	☐	☐

Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated. As previously stated, the Development Area and Project Site are located within an urbanized area and is currently developed as a regional shopping center with large surface parking areas. There are no wildlife corridors or native wildlife nursery sites within the Development Area or the Project Site. On-site vegetation is limited to ornamental, non-native shrubs and trees. Although unlikely, these trees could potentially provide nesting sites for migratory birds. Thus, pursuant to Mitigation Measure IV-1, the Project would comply with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA), which regulates vegetation removal during the nesting season to ensure that significant impacts to migratory birds would not occur. Implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO 4-1 would ensure that impacts are less than significant.

Mitigation Measure BIO 4-1: The recognized nesting bird season in Southern California is from February 1 through August 30. All grading and other site preparation activities should avoid this period of time. If such avoidance is not feasible, then no more than 5 days prior to construction or site preparation activities the Applicant shall retain the services of a qualified biologist approved by the City. The biologist shall conduct on-site surveys to determine if active nests of special-status and common bird species protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and/or the California Fish and Game Code, are present within 300 feet of the construction zone. If active nests are found on or immediately adjacent to the site, a minimum 300-foot buffer area (500 feet for raptors) shall be temporarily fenced around the nest site. No construction activities shall be permitted within this nest zone until the young birds have fledged, as determined by the biologist.

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	☐	☐	☐	☒

No Impact. The Development Area includes 65 trees, which may be removed under the Project. However, none of these trees are protected under City Ordinance Section 33-1069(b), Vegetation Protection and Replacement Standards. The Project would comply with Section 33-1339(j), which requires a one to one replacement of all street trees removed as a result of the Project. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. No impacts would occur, and no mitigation measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP), Natural Community Conservation Plan (NCCP), or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒

No Impact. The Development Area and Project Site lie within the boundaries of the Draft Escondido Subarea Plan's Southern Habitat Area.[9] However, the Development Area and the Project Site are located within an urbanized area and are currently developed as a regional shopping with large surface parking areas and ornamental landscaping. Within the Draft Escondido Subarea Plan, the entire Project Site is designated as Developed and Disturbed Land.[10] As such, the Project Site does not support any habitat or natural community. Accordingly, there are no Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservation Plans, or other approved habitat conservation plans that apply to the Project Site or Development Area. Thus, the Project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan, or other related plans. No impacts would occur, and no mitigation measures are required.

[9] *City of Escondido General Plan Update, Downtown Specific Plan Update, and Climate Action Plan Environmental Impact Report, Volume I—Final Environmental Impact Report, April 23, 2012, Section 4.4 Biological Resources.*

[10] *Draft Escondido Subarea Plan, June 2001, Section 2 Description of the Escondido Subarea, Figure 2-5.*

5. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5?	☐	☐	☐	☒

No Impact. Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines generally defines a historical resource as a resource that is: (1) listed in, or determined to be eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (California Register); (2) included in a local register of historical resources (pursuant to Section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code); or (3) identified as significant in an historical resources survey (meeting the criteria in Section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code). Additionally, any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which a lead agency determines to be historically significant or significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California may be considered to be an historical resource, provided the lead agency's determination is supported by substantial evidence in light of the whole record. Generally, a resource shall be considered by the lead agency to be "historically significant" if the resource meets the criteria for listing on the California Register. The California Register automatically includes all properties listed in the National Register of Historic Places (National Register) and those formally determined to be eligible for listing in the National Register.

The Project Site is not listed in the National Register or the California Register or recognized as a cultural site by the City of Escondido.[11, 12] Additionally, there are no recognized cultural sites on or adjacent to the Project Site. As such, implementation of the Project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource. No impacts would occur, and no mitigation measures are required.

---

[11] *California State Parks, Office of Historic Preservation, California Historical Resources, http://ohp.parks.ca.gov/ListedResources/?view=county&criteria=37 (Accessed April 4, 2015).*

[12] *City of Escondido General Plan, Chapter VII – Resource Conservation, May 2012, Figure VII-6.*

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5?	☐	☒	☐	☐

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated. Section 15064.5(a)(3)(D) of the CEQA Guidelines generally defines archaeological resources as any resource that "has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important to prehistory or history." Archaeological resources are features, such as tools, utensils, carvings, fabric, building foundations, etc., that document evidence of past human endeavors and that may be historically or culturally important to a significant earlier community.

The Project Site is not recognized as an archaeological site by the City of Escondido.[13] The Project Site is located within an urbanized area and has been subject to ground disturbance in the past. In particular, the Development Area is currently developed as a surface parking lot. Thus, surficial archaeological resources that may have existed on-site at one time have likely been previously disturbed. In addition, although the Project involves additional grading, excavation, and other construction activities, the potential to encounter archaeological resources is anticipated to be low due to the developed nature of the Development Area and Project Site. Notwithstanding, the following mitigation measures are recommended to ensure that the Project's potential impact on any previously undiscovered archaeological resources is addressed:

Mitigation Measure CUL 5-1: If any archaeological materials are encountered during the course of the Project development, work in the area shall cease and deposits shall be treated in accordance with federal, State, and local guidelines, including those set forth in California Public Resources Code Section 21083.2. As part of this effort, the services of an archaeologist meeting the Secretary of the Interior Professional Qualification Standards for Archaeology shall be secured by contacting the California Historical Resources Information System South Coastal Information Center (CHRIS-SCIC) at San Diego State University, or a member of the Register of Professional Archaeologists (RPA) to assess the resources and evaluate the impact. In addition, if it is determined that an archaeological site is a historical resource, the provisions of Section

[13] *City of Escondido General Plan, Chapter VII – Resource Conservation, May 2012, Figure VII-6.*

21084.1 of the Public Resources Code and CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 would be implemented.

Mitigation Measure CUL 5-2: If any archaeological materials are encountered during the course of the Project development, a report on the archaeological findings shall be prepared by a qualified archaeologist. A copy of the report shall be submitted to the CHRIS-SCIC.

Compliance with the above mitigation measures would ensure that Project impacts to any previously undiscovered archaeological resources would be less than significant.

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
c. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	☐	☒	☐	☐

Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. Although no human remains are known to have been found on the Project Site or Development Area, there is the possibility that unknown resources could be encountered during Project construction, particularly during ground-disturbing activities such as excavation and grading. While the uncovering of human remains is not anticipated, the following mitigation measure is recommended to ensure that the Project's potential impact on any previously undiscovered human remains is addressed:

Mitigation Measure CUL 5-3: As required by State law (e.g., Public Resources Code Section 5097.98, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5, and California Code of Regulations Section 15064.5(e)), if human remains are discovered at the Project Site during construction, work at the specific construction site at which the remains have been uncovered shall be suspended, and the San Diego County coroner shall be immediately notified. If the remains are determined by the County coroner to be Native American, the Native American Heritage Commission shall be notified within 24 hours, and the guidelines of the Native American Heritage Commission shall be adhered to in the treatment and disposition of the remains.

Compliance with regulatory requirements and implementation of the above mitigation measure would ensure that Project impacts to unknown human remains would be less than significant.

6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:

The following discussion is based in part on the *Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation, Proposed Regal Cinemas, Westfield North County Shopping Center, Escondido, California,* prepared by Leighton Consulting, Inc., dated August 7, 2015, which is provided as Appendix B of this Initial Study.

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i. 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 active fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	☐	☐	☒	☐

Less Than Significant Impact. Fault rupture is defined as the surface displacement that occurs along the surface of a fault during an earthquake. Based on criteria established by the California Geological Survey (CGS), faults can be classified as active, potentially active, or inactive. Active faults may be designated as Earthquake Fault Zones under the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, which includes standards for regulating development adjacent to active faults. These zones, which extend from 200 to 500 feet on each side of the known fault, identify areas where a potential surface fault rupture could prove hazardous for buildings used for human occupancy. Development projects located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone are required to prepare special geotechnical studies to characterize hazards from any potential surface ruptures.

According to the Geotechnical Investigation conducted for the Project and based on current available geologic information, no active faults are known to exist on or in the immediate vicinity of the Project Site.[14] The closest known potentially active fault is the Rose

[14] *California Emergency Management Agency, My Hazards Mapping Program; http://myhazards.calema.ca.gov/, accessed July 1, 2015.*

Canyon Fault, which lies approximately 15.5 miles west of the Project Site.[15,16] As there are no known faults or Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones located on the Project Site or within the City, the potential for fault rupture is considered low. Furthermore, the Project would be designed and constructed in accordance with applicable building standards and requirements to minimize seismic-related hazards. Therefore, potential impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project Site is located in the seismically active southern California region and could be subjected to moderate to strong ground shaking in the event of an earthquake along one of the many active Southern California faults. As previously stated, the closest active fault to the Project Site with the potential to generate seismic ground shaking is the Rose Canyon Fault, which lies approximately 15.5 miles west of the Project Site.[17,18]

Building design and construction of the proposed theater building would be required to conform to the current seismic design provisions of the California Building Code (CBC). The 2013 CBC incorporates the latest seismic design standards for structural loads and materials to mitigate losses from an earthquake and provide for the latest in earthquake safety. Compliance with regulatory requirements would reduce impacts associated with seismic ground shaking to a less than significant level. No mitigation measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	☐	☒	☐	☐

---

[15] *Leighton Consulting, Inc., Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation, Proposed Cinemas, Westfield North County Shopping Center, Escondido, California, August 7, 2015; refer to Appendix B of this Initial Study.*

[16] *City of Escondido General Plan, Community Protection Element, Seismicity and Soils, May 2012.*

[17] *Leighton Consulting, Inc., Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation, Proposed Cinemas, Westfield North County Shopping Center, Escondido, California, August 7, 2015; refer to Appendix B of this Initial Study.*

[18] *City of Escondido General Plan, Community Protection Element, Seismicity and Soils, May 2012*

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated. Liquefaction is a form of earthquake-induced ground failure that occurs primarily in relatively shallow, loose, granular, water-saturated soils. Liquefaction can occur when these types of soils lose their shear strength due to excess water pressure that builds up during repeated seismic shaking. A shallow groundwater table, the presence of loose to medium dense sand and silty sand, and a long duration and high acceleration of seismic shaking are factors that contribute to the potential for liquefaction. Liquefaction usually results in horizontal and vertical movements from lateral spreading of liquefied materials.

Based on information from CGS, the Project Site is not located in an area susceptible to liquefaction.[19] Notwithstanding, according to the General Plan the Project is located within a Liquefaction Hazard Area.[20] The soil underlying the Project Site consists of older alluvial river deposits, moderately consolidated sediments, and silty sand with gravel and clay.[21] These soils generally have a low susceptibility to seismic-induced settlement. The results of the Geotechnical Investigation conducted for the Project concluded that some of the underlying alluvial deposits are susceptible to liquefaction. Specifically, total dynamic settlement was estimated to range from less than 0.5 to 3.75 inches, and differential dynamic settlement was estimated at 2 inches or less across the site.

Accordingly, the Geotechnical Investigation recommends the use of deep foundations or ground improvement with conventional shallow foundations, designed and implemented by a specialty contractor, in conjunction with field verification using cone penetration tests. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 6-1 would ensure such recommendations are incorporated into the Project to reduce impacts to a less than significant level:

Mitigation Measure GEO 6-1: All development activities conducted on the Project Site shall be consistent with the following:

(1) The professional engineering recommendations contained in the Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation, Proposed Cinemas, Westfield North County Shopping Center, Escondido, California (Leighton Consulting, Inc., August 7, 2015), provided the recommendations meet the conditions specified in Subsection (3) of this Mitigation Measure.

---

[19] *California Emergency Management Agency, My Hazards Mapping Program; http://myhazards.calema.ca.gov/, accessed July 2, 2015.*

[20] *City of Escondido General Plan, Community Protection Element, Figure VI-9, Seismic and Geologic Hazards, May 2012.*

[21] *California Division of Mines and Geology, in cooperation with the U.S. Geological Survey, Geologic Map of the Escondido 7.5' Quadrangle, San Diego County, California. A Digital Database, 1999 ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dmg/rgmp/Prelim_geo_pdf/escondido.pdf, accessed July 2, 2015.*

(2) Alternative recommendations based on the findings of site-specific, design-level geotechnical investigation(s) approved by the City of Escondido Department of Public Works, Engineering Division, including but not limited to the use of proven methods generally accepted by registered engineers to reduce the risk of seismic hazards to a less than significant level, provided such recommendations meet the conditions specified in Subsection (3) of this Mitigation Measure.

(3) All recommendations shall comply with or exceed applicable provisions and standards set forth in or established by:

(a) California Geological Survey's Guidelines for Evaluating and Mitigating Seismic Hazards in California, Special Publication No. 117;

(b) The version of the California Building Code, as adopted and amended by the City of Escondido, in effect at the time of approval of the geotechnical investigation(s) by the City of Escondido Department of Public Works, Engineering Division;

(c) Relevant state and City laws, ordinances, and Code requirements; and

(d) Current standards of practice designed to minimize potential geologic and geotechnical impacts.

Compliance with this mitigation measure would ensure that Project impacts with respect to seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction, would be less than significant.

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
iv. Landslides?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project is not located within a City designated landslide area or CGS-delineated landslide zone. The Project Site is generally flat, as is much of the surrounding Project vicinity. The Project Site is not in close proximity to any mountains or steep slopes. Furthermore, the Geotechnical Investigation conducted for the Project indicated no potential for landslides on or near the Project Site and no evidence of former landslides on-site. Therefore, the Project would not expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects involving landslides. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Less Than Significant Impact. Development of the Project would require grading, excavation, and other construction activities that have the potential to disturb existing soils and expose soils to rainfall and wind, thereby potentially resulting in soil erosion. This potential would be reduced by implementation of standard erosion controls imposed during site preparation and grading activities. As the Project would feature over one acre of ground disturbance, grading and construction activities would be subject to compliance with National Pollutant Discharge elimination system (NPDES) requirements and the State Water Resources Control Board's Construction General Permit (Order 2009-0009-DWQ). Compliance with the Construction General Permit would include the preparation and implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), which must incorporate project-specific best management practices (BMPs) to ensure that erosion is minimized. Therefore, impacts in relation to erosion or loss of topsoil would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	☐	☒	☐	☐

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated. Potential impacts associated with liquefaction and lateral spreading are discussed in Response to Checklist Question No. 6.a(iii). As discussed in Response to Checklist Question No. 6.a(iv), the Project Site is relatively flat and is not susceptible to landslides. Potential impacts with respect to other soil instability issues, including subsidence, collapse, and settlement potential, are addressed below.

Subsidence is a localized mass movement that involves the gradual downward settling or sinking of the ground, occurring occasionally from the extraction of mineral resources, subsurface oil, groundwater, or other subsurface liquids, such as natural gas. The Project Site is not located within an area of known subsidence associated with oil or ground water withdrawal, peat oxidation or hydro-compaction. Furthermore, the Project does not include the

extraction of oil or groundwater from aquifers under the Project Site. As such, the potential for subsidence to occur on-site is low.

According to the Geotechnical Investigation, the artificial fill soils on-site have low compressibility and low collapse potential. However, the existing surficial fill soils are not considered suitable to support settlement-sensitive structures. In addition, the underlying alluvial soils site exhibit an unconsolidated character which may be subject to settlement from building loads or additional fill material. As such, the Geotechnical Investigation recommends remedial grading of the upper two to three feet below existing or proposed grade, whichever is deeper, and the use of either deep foundations or ground improvement with conventional shallow foundations. Mitigation Measure 6-1, presented above, would ensure such recommendations would be incorporated into the Project. Compliance with this mitigation measure would ensure that Project impacts with respect to soil instability, including settlement potential, would be less than significant.

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Less Than Significant Impact. Expansive soils are typically associated with fine-grained clayey soils that have the potential to shrink and swell with repeated cycles of wetting and drying. The soils beneath the Project Site are not identified as expansive soils.[22] The Geotechnical Investigation indicates that soils on the Project Site generally possess low to medium expansion potential. Therefore, impacts related to expansive soils would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

[22] *California Division of Mines and Geology, in cooperation with the U.S. Geological Survey, Geologic Map of the Escondido 7.5' Quadrangle, San Diego County, California. A Digital Database, 1999 ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dmg/rgmp/Prelim_geo_pdf/escondido.pdf, accessed July 2, 2015.*

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	☐	☐	☐	☒

No Impact. The Project Site is located within a community served by existing sewer infrastructure. Therefore, wastewater generated by the Project would be accommodated via connections to the existing sewage infrastructure located in the Project area. As such, the Project would not require the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. Thus, the Project would not result in impacts related to the ability of soils to support septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. No impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are required.

7. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a. Generate greenhouse gas (GHGs) emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b. Conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Less Than Significant Impact (a and b). The City's Climate Action Plan (E-CAP) is consistent with and complementary to the GHG emissions reduction efforts being conducted by the State through the Global Warming Solutions Act (AB 32).[23] E-CAP includes reducing 26,807 metric tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalents ($MTCO_2e$) per year from new development by 2020 as compared to the 2020 unmitigated conditions and would be consistent with the goals of AB 32. Mitigation of GHG emissions impacts through the Development Review Process (DRP) provides one of the most substantial reduction strategies for reducing community-wide emissions associated with new development. The DRP procedures for evaluating GHG impacts and determining significance for CEQA purposes is streamlined by: (1) applying an emissions level that is determined to be less than significant for small projects; and (2) utilizing Screening Tables to mitigate project GHG emissions that exceed the threshold level. Projects have the option of preparing a project-specific technical analysis to quantify and mitigate GHG emissions. A threshold level of 2,500 $MTCO_2e$ per year is used to identify projects that require the use of Screening Tables or a project-specific technical analysis to quantify and mitigate project emissions.

The Project would result in direct and indirect GHG emissions generated by different types of emissions sources, including:

- Construction: emissions associated with demolition of the existing parking lot, site preparation, excavation, grading, and construction-related equipment and vehicular activity;

[23] *City of Escondido, Climate Action Plan, 2013, www.escondido.org/Data/Sites/1/media/PDFs/Planning/ClimateActionPlan/AdoptedClimateActionPlan.pdf.*

- Mobile: emissions associated vehicular exhaust from trips to and from the Project site;
- Area Sources: emissions associated with consumer products, and landscape equipment;
- Building operations: emissions associated with space heating and cooling, water heating, and lighting;
- Water: emissions associated with energy used to pump, convey, deliver, and treat water; and
- Solid waste: emissions associated with waste streams (embodied energy of materials).

GHG emissions during construction and operation of the Project were calculated using the City's recommended CalEEMod. As shown in Table 3 on page 34, the Project would result in an annual total of 1,610 $MTCO_2e$ and would not exceed the City's 2,500 $MTCO_2e$ per year screening threshold. As the 2,500 $MTCO_2e$ per year threshold has been developed as part of the E-CAP development review process, the Project would not interfere with implementation of the E-CAP. Consequently, the implementation of the proposed Project would not hinder the ability of the State to achieve AB 32's goal of achieving 1990 levels of GHG emissions by 2020. In addition, once the energy and water consumption reductions from Compliance with the mandatory requirements of CALGreen are accounted for, the GHG emissions associated with the proposed Project would be even lower.

Table 3
Annual GHG Emissions Summary

Emission Source	Emissions ($MTCO_2e$)
Construction[a]	294
City's GHG Screening Threshold	2,500
Significant Impact?	No
Operations	
Area	<1
Energy Consumption	170
Mobile	1,219
Solid Waste	131
Water Consumption	90
Total Operations	**1,610**
City's GHG Screening Threshold	2,500
Significant Impact?	No

[a] *Construction emissions would only be temporary and would cease after Project completion.*

Source: Eyestone Environmental, 2015.

8. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Less Than Significant Impact. The types and amounts of hazardous materials used in connection with the Project would be typical of those used in commercial developments (e.g., cleaning solvents, pesticides for landscaping, painting supplies, and petroleum products). Construction of the Project also may involve the temporary use of potentially hazardous materials, including vehicle fuels, paints, oils, and transmission fluids. However, all potentially hazardous materials would be contained, stored, and used in accordance with manufacturers' instructions and handled in compliance with applicable federal, State, and local regulations. Any associated risk would be adequately reduced to a less than significant level through compliance with these standards and regulations. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
b. 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?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Less than Significant Impact. Based on the State Water Board's Geotracker Database, there are no aboveground storage tanks (ASTs) or underground storage tanks (USTs) located within the Project Site.[24] As discussed above, Project construction and operation would involve the limited use of hazardous materials that are typically used in commercial developments. However, all such materials would be used in accordance with manufacturers' instructions and handled in compliance with applicable federal, State, and local regulations. Therefore, the use of such materials would not create a significant hazard to the

[24] *The State Water Board's Geotracker Database http://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/ Accessed July 2, 2015.*

public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	☐	☐	☐	☒

No Impact. There are no existing or proposed schools within 0.25 mile of the Project Site. The closest school is San Pasqual High School, which is approximately 0.5 mile northeast of the site. As previously discussed, Project construction and operation would involve the limited use of hazardous materials typically used in the maintenance of commercial uses, all of which would be used, stored, and disposed of in accordance with manufacturers' specifications and in compliance with applicable federal, State, and local regulations. As such, the Project would not create a significant hazard to nearby schools, and no mitigation measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
d. 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

No Impact. The Project Site is not identified on any lists of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. These lists include the Department of Toxic Substances Control EnviroStor Database, the State Water Board's Geotracker Database, the California Environmental Protection Agency's (CalEPA) list of sites with active Cease and Desist Orders or Cleanup and Abatement Orders, and a list of contaminated solid

waste disposal sites.[25] Therefore, no impacts associated with a hazardous materials site would occur, and no mitigation measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
e. 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 for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☐	☒

No Impact. The Project Site is not located within 2 miles of an airport or within an airport planning area. The nearest public airport is the Ramona Airport, located approximately 9 miles southeast of the Project Site in the County of San Diego. The Project would not result in an airport-related safety hazard for people residing or working in the Project area. Therefore, no impacts would occur, and no mitigation measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☐	☒

No Impact. There are no private airstrips in the vicinity of the Project Site. The Project would not result in an airport-related safety hazard for people residing or working in the Project area. Therefore, no impacts would occur, and no mitigation measures are required.

[25] *State Water Board's Geotracker Database http://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/; Department of Toxic Substances Control EnviroStor Database www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/; Cortese Lis Data Resources, www.calepa.ca.gov/SiteCleanup/CorteseList/; accessed May 21, 2015.*

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Less than Significant Impact. The Project Site is located adjacent to Bear Valley Parkway, which is designated as an evacuation route in the City of Escondido General Plan. However, the Development Area is located off of Beethoven Avenue, approximately 1,500 feet north of Bear Valley Parkway. The Project does not include improvements along Bear Valley Parkway that would alter the existing lane configurations of these streets, nor does the Project require the installation of any barriers that would impede emergency response within or surrounding the Project Site. Therefore, the Project would not cause an impediment along any of the City's designated evacuation routes or impair implementation of the City's emergency response plan. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
h. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Less than Significant Impact. According to the California Emergency Management Agency, the Project Site is located within a High Fire Hazard Severity Zone.[26] Notwithstanding, through compliance with applicable City requirements regarding wildfire risks, implementation of the Project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildfires. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

[26] *California Emergency Management Agency, My Hazards Mapping Program; http://myhazards.calema.ca.gov/, accessed July 2, 2015.*

9. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:

The following discussion is based in part on the *Preliminary Water Quality Technical Report (WQTR) for Westfield North County Mall Cinema Project, 200-290 East Via Rancho Parkway, City of Escondido, California*, prepared by R.A. Smith National, dated July 27, 2015, which is provided as Appendix C of this Initial Study. This report was used in this document as it evaluates future conditions with the Project against existing conditions as required by CEQA. In accordance with the City's requirements, a second analysis was prepared that evaluates future conditions with the Project against assumed condition that the Project Site is entirely pervious. This analysis is also provided in Appendix C.[27]

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Less Than Significant Impact. During Project construction, particularly during the grading and excavation phases, stormwater runoff from precipitation events could cause exposed and stockpiled soils to be subject to erosion and convey sediments into municipal storm drain systems. In addition, on-site watering activities to reduce airborne dust could contribute to pollutant loading in runoff. Pollutant discharges related to the storage, handling, use and disposal of chemicals, adhesives, coatings, lubricants, and fuel could also occur. Thus, Project-related construction activities could have the potential to result in adverse effects on water quality. However, as previously discussed, the Project would be required to obtain coverage under the General Construction Permit (Order No. 99-08-DWQ) pursuant to NPDES requirements. Accordingly, a SWPPP would be developed and implemented during Project construction. The SWPPP would outline appropriate BMPs and other erosion control measures to minimize the discharge of pollutants in stormwater runoff. The SWPPP would be carried out in compliance with State Water Resources Control Board requirements. Additionally, the Project would include high-flow rate stormwater planters, vegetated buffers, bioretention, and biofiltration improvements to protect water quality during Project operations and meet low impact development (LID) requirements. Compliance with regulatory requirements, including implementation of BMPs, would ensure the Project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. Impacts to water quality would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

---

[27] *Per the requirements of the City's* Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan Requirements for Development Projects*, date January 2011, the Project's Water Quality Technical Report must evaluate the post-development conditions against the pre-development condition of the Project Site, prior to the construction of the existing surface parking lot.*

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Less Than Significant Impact. Based on the Geotechnical Investigation prepared for the Project, groundwater was encountered at approximately 15 feet below grade surface (bgs). Project grading would involve soil removal and recompaction to a depth of three feet below the new improvements or a minimum of two feet below existing grade, whichever is deeper. As such, grading activities are not anticipated to encounter groundwater, and Project construction would not require dewatering or other groundwater withdrawals. Therefore, Project construction would not deplete groundwater supplies.

Under existing conditions approximately 13.5 percent of the Development Area is comprised of pervious surfaces (e.g., landscaping). Replacement of the existing parking area with the proposed theater and pedestrian plaza would not substantially increase the impervious surface area on-site, with an estimated 14 percent of pervious surfaces remaining within the Development Area. Thus, the Project would not substantially reduce groundwater recharge or result in a reduction in groundwater levels or supplies. Impacts on groundwater would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Less Than Significant Impact. The Development Area is currently developed as a surface parking area, and surface water generally sheet flows in a southeasterly direction to storm drain inlets that connect to a 30-inch storm drain in Beethoven Drive, which eventually

flow towards the San Dieguito River. A 30-inch storm drain also traverses the Project Site along the northwestern boundary of the Development Area and connects to the local system in Beethoven Drive. As detailed in the Preliminary Water Quality Technical Report, under Project conditions stormwater would continue to be directed to the existing storm drains located along Beethoven Drive, as well as along the northwest portion of the Development Area. In addition, Project improvements would include post-construction BMPs such as the use of stormwater planters, vegetated buffers, bioretention, and biofiltration improvements to manage stormwater and minimize the transport of soil or silt (i.e., erosion and siltation). Furthermore, no watercourses exist on-site. As such, the Project would not alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Less Than Significant Impact. As discussed above in Response to Checklist Question No. 9.c, Project implementation would not alter drainage patterns on-site. In addition, as the amount of impervious surface area would not change substantially as a result of Project development (see Response to Checklist Question No. 9.b), the rate and volume of surface water runoff would not noticeably increase. Specifically, with the implementation of BMPs, the peak flow rate within the Development Area would decrease from 1.56 cubic feet per second (cfs) to 1.54 cfs. The existing storm drain system would be able to accommodate Project drainage flows, and downstream flows to the San Dieguito River watershed would not be impacted. Thus, the Project would not substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on-site or off-site. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required**.**

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
e. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Less Than Significant Impact. As discussed in Response to Checklist Question Nos. 9.c and 9.d, above, Project implementation would not alter drainage patterns on-site, substantially increase the amount of impervious surface area on-site, or cause an increase in the rate or volume of surface water runoff. The existing storm drain system would have sufficient capacity to accommodate Project stormwater flows. In addition, as discussed in Response to Checklist Question No. 9.a, with compliance with NPDES requirements and the City's LID requirements, the Project would not result in additional sources of polluted runoff. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Less Than Significant Impact. As discussed in Response to Checklist Question 9.a, above, with implementation of regulatory requirements, water quality impacts associated with construction and operation of the Project would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
g. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	☐	☐	☐	☒

No Impact. The Project Site is not located within a 100-year flood plain, as mapped by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA).[28] Thus, no impacts associated with a 100-year flood plain would occur, and no mitigation measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	☐	☐	☐	☒

No Impact. As discussed above, the Project Site is not located within a designated 100-year flood plain area, and the Project would not include any residential uses. Thus, the Project would not place structures that would impede or redirect flood flows within a 100-year flood plain. No impacts would occur, and no mitigation measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
i. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	☐	☐	☐	☒

No Impact. The Project is not located within a designated inundation area associated with the failure of a levee or dam. As such, impacts associated with the exposure of people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding would not occur. No impacts would occur, and no mitigation measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	☐	☐	☐	☒

No Impact. The Project Site is located approximately 13 miles east of the Pacific Ocean and is not in close proximity to an enclosed body of water. The nearest body of water is Lake Hodges, located approximately 0.75 mile south, which lies at a lower elevation than the Project Site. Further, the Project Site is not located downslope from any area potentially

[28] *Federal Emergency Management Agency, Flood Insurance Rate Map, Map Number 06073C1079G, June 19, 1997.*

subject to mudslides; thus, mudflow risks do not exist on-site. The Geotechnical Investigation conducted for the Project indicates the possibility of tsunami and seiche is considered low. Impacts associated with a seiche, tsunami or mudflow would not occur, and no mitigation measures are required.

10. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a. Physically divide an established community?	☐	☐	☐	☒

No Impact. The Project Site is located within an urbanized area is currently developed as a regional shopping center with large surface parking areas. The Project Site is essentially a self-contained area, surrounded on all sides by existing roadways, and there are no residential uses directly adjacent to the site. The proposed theater building and outdoor pedestrian plaza would be located within the Development Area, which is a 1.25-acre surface parking area in the eastern portion of the Project Site. According to the General Plan Update EIR, the Project is located within the Westfield Shoppingtown Target Area, which is characterized by the multi-story regional shopping center with several anchor tenants, smaller shops, and free-standing upscale dining establishments. The City's General Plan establishes guiding principles for achieving the buildout vision for each target area. Per the General Plan, the City would continue to promote expansion efforts within the Westfield Shoppingtown Target Area by attracting businesses that complement the existing uses.[29] The proposed expansion of the shopping center to include a theater and outdoor pedestrian plaza is consistent with the City's vision for the Westfield Shoppingtown area and would not change the intended land use of the Project Site. Project development would occur entirely within the existing self-contained shopping center site and would not physically divide any established community. Therefore, no impacts would occur, and no mitigation measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
b. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	☐	☐	☒	☐

[29] *City of Escondido General Plan, Chapter II, Page II-72, Land Use and Community Form, May 2012.*

Less Than Significant Impact. The City of Escondido General Plan and the City of Escondido Municipal Code (EMC) govern land use through specific land use restrictions, design standards, and building and safety codes. The Project Site and Development Area are zoned Planned Development—Commercial (PD-C), with a corresponding General Plan land use designation of Planned Commercial.[30,31] The Project Site and Development Area are also located within the Kit Carson Park Overlay.[32] The Kit Carson Overlay provides the guidelines necessary to preserve and enhance the atmosphere and character of the park through the coordination of private and public facilities serving the park and its immediate environs.

The Planned Commercial General Plan land use designation allows for a variety of commercial activities within a self-contained, comprehensively planned center, including office and professional uses, tourist serving facilities, specialty retail, and other retail/service uses.[33] The City's General Plan delineates Opportunity Areas, which include Target Areas and Specific Planning Areas. These Opportunity Areas have been identified for focused infrastructure improvements in order to promote development, enhance job growth, increase housing options, and revitalize the community. Each Opportunity Area has guiding principles for achieving the City's buildout vision. As previously indicated, the Project is located within the Westfield Regional Shopping Center, also referred to as the Westfield Shoppingtown Target Area, which is characterized by the multi-story regional shopping center with several anchor tenants, smaller shops, and free-standing upscale dining establishments. The guiding principles for the Westfield Shoppingtown Target Area are as follows:

- Continue to coordinate future shopping center expansion efforts that attract a regional customer base and support City Revenues.
- Consider opportunities and incentives that increase employment densities and attract businesses including office, theater, hotel, entertainment and visitor serving uses that complement existing retail and offer salaries that raise that City's median income and improve the jobs/housing balance.
- Promote transit access and connection for the site and consider opportunities for amending parking requirements as transit use to and from the site increases.[34]

---

30 *Escondido Municipal Code, Chapter 33, Article 16, Section 33-331.*

31 *City of Escondido General Plan, Chapter II, Land USE and Community Form, May 2012, Figure II-1, Land Uses.*

32 *City of Escondido City Council, Resolution No. 4679*

33 *City of Escondido General Plan, Chapter II, Land Use and Community Form, May 2012, at page II-30 and Figure II-7, Planned Commercial Areas.*

34 *City of Escondido General Plan, Chapter II, Land Use and Community Form, May 2012, at page II-61 and Figure II-18, Planned Commercial Areas.*

The Project would involve the construction of a theater building, an outdoor pedestrian plaza, and Project signage within the Development Area. The proposed theater use and outdoor pedestrian plaza would be consistent with the uses identified for the Planned Commercial designation. In addition, the Project would be consistent with the guiding principles for the Westfield Shoppingtown Target Area since it would attract regional customers, provide employment opportunities, and be located in an area that has several established public transit routes.

The proposed theater use and outdoor pedestrian plaza also are permitted uses within the PD-C zone. The maximum height of the theater building would be approximately 48 feet, which is lower than the 70-foot maximum height of the existing mall structure. Minimum building setback requirements for the Project Site are 10 feet from Beethoven Drive and 30 feet from Bear Valley Parkway. Proposed setbacks for the theater building would be a minimum of 20 feet from Beethoven Drive and thus would comply with the established setback requirement. The Project also would include the installation of a pylon sign near the corner of Beethoven Drive and Bear Valley Parkway, as show in Figure A-4 in Attachment A, Project Description, of this MND. The proposed pylon sign would have a maximum height of 28 feet and a minimum setback of 10 feet from Bear Valley Parkway. Accordingly, the Applicant would request approval from the City to install the pylon sign within the 30-foot setback area along Bear Valley Parkway as part of the modification to the Master Development Plan and Master Sign Program. The Project would be consistent with all other requirements of the PD-C zone, including lighting, signage, landscaping, and parking requirements.

Based on the analysis above, the Project would not conflict with the Planned Commercial land use designation of the General Plan or with the requirements of the PD-C zone. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigations are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒

No Impact. As previously discussed, the Development Area and Project Site lie within the boundaries of the Draft Escondido Subarea Plan's Southern Habitat Area.[35] However, the

[35] *City of Escondido General Plan Update, Downtown Specific Plan Update, and Climate Action Plan Environmental Impact Report, Volume I, Final Environmental Impact Report, April 23, 2012, Section 4.4 Biological Resources.*

Development Area and the Project Site are located within an urbanized area and are currently developed as a regional shopping with large surface parking areas and ornamental landscaping. Within the Draft Escondido Subarea Plan, the Project Site is designated as Developed and Disturbed Land.[36] Accordingly, there are no Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservation Plans, or other approved habitat conservation plans that apply to development within the Project Site or Development Area. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. No impacts would occur, and no mitigation measures would be required.

[36] *Draft Escondido Subarea Plan, June 2001, Section 2, Description of the Escondido Subarea, Figure 2-5.*

11. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒

No Impact (a and b). The Project Site is not located within a City-designated Mineral Resource Zone, where significant mineral deposits are known to be present, nor is the site classified as a mineral producing area by the California or U.S. Geological Surveys.[37] No permitted mineral extraction operations occur on the Project Site or the City of Escondido.[38] Therefore, the Project would not result in the loss of availability of a mineral resource or a mineral resource recovery site. No impacts would occur, and no mitigation measures are required.

[37] *State of California Department of Conservations, Division of Mines and Geology, U.S. Geological Survey (2000), Map of California Principal Mineral-Producing Localities; http://minerals.usgs.gov/minerals/pubs/state/980601mp.pdf, accessed July 2015.*

[38] *California Department of Conservation, Mine Reclamation—AB 3098 List, www.conservation.ca.gov/omr/SMARA%20Mines/ab_3098_list/Documents/April%202015%20AB3098%20List.pdf, accessed July 2015.*

12. NOISE. Would the project result in:

The following discussion is based in part on the noise worksheets prepared for the Project and provided as Appendix D of this Initial Study.

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Less Than Significant. The following analysis evaluates the potential noise impacts at noise-sensitive land uses resulting from construction and operation of the Project. For contextual purposes, the discussion begins with a summary of applicable noise regulations, which were used to define the significance thresholds used in this analysis.

Applicable Noise Regulations

The Community Protection Element of the City of Escondido General Plan establishes noise exposure guidelines for land use compatibility and includes a number of goals, objectives, and policies for land use planning purposes. The General Plan also provides thresholds for determining environmental noise impacts of a project. In addition, the City of Escondido Municipal Code, Chapter 17, Article 12, *Noise Abatement and Control* provides regulations to control unnecessary, excessive, and annoying noise. These regulations are described further below.

City of Escondido General Plan

The following General Plan Community Protection Element policies and objectives are applicable to the Project:[39]

- Noise Policy 5.1: Require development to meet acceptable exterior noise level standard as established in Figure VI-2 of the General Plan (see Table 4 on page 51).

[39] *City of Escondido, Escondido General Plan Community Protection, May 2012.*

Table 4
Land Use Compatibility for Community Noise Sources

Land Use	Community Noise Exposure L_{dn} or CNEL, dBA			
	Normally Acceptable	**Conditionally Acceptable**	**Normally Unacceptable**	**Clearly Unacceptable**
Residential- Single-Family, Duplex, Mobile Home	50–60	60–70	70–75	> 75
Residential- Multi-Family, Residential Mixed Use	50–65	60–70	70–75	> 75
Transient Lodging, Motels, Hotels	50–65	60–70	70–80	> 80
Schools, Libraries, Churches, Hospitals, Nursing Homes	50–65	60–70	70–80	> 80
Auditoriums, Concert Halls, Amphitheaters	—	50–70	> 65	—
Sports Arena, Outdoor Spectator Sports	—	50–75	> 70	—
Playgrounds, Parks	50–70	—	67.5–75	> 72.5
Golf Courses, Riding Stables, Water Recreation, Cemeteries	50–75	—	70–80	> 80
Office Buildings, Business and Professional Commercial	50–70	67.5–77.5	> 75	—
Industrial, Manufacturing, Utilities, Agriculture	50–75	70–80	> 80	—

Normally Acceptable: Specified land use is satisfactory, based upon the assumption that any buildings involved are of normal conventional construction, without any special noise insulation requirements.

Conditionally Acceptable: New construction or development should be undertaken only after a detailed analysis of the noise reduction requirements is made and needed noise insulation features included in the design. Conventional construction, but with closed windows and fresh air supply systems or air conditioning will usually suffice.

Normally Unacceptable: New construction or development should generally be discouraged. If new construction or development does proceed, a detailed analysis of the noise reduction requirements must be made with noise insulation features included in the design.

Clearly Unacceptable: New construction or development should generally not be undertaken.

Source: City of Escondido General Plan, Community Protection Element, May 2012.

- Noise Policy 5.3: Require noise attenuation for outdoor spaces in all development where projected incremental exterior noise levels exceed those shown in Figure VI-14 of the General Plan (see Table 5 on page 52)

- Noise Policy 5.5: Require construction projects and new development to ensure acceptable vibration levels at nearby noise-sensitive uses based on Federal Transit Administration criteria.

Table 5
Exterior Incremental Environmental Noise Impact Standards for Noise-Sensitive Uses (dBA)

Residences and Buildings Where People Normally Sleep[a]		Institutional Land Uses with Primarily Daytime and Evening Uses[b]	
Existing L_{dn}[c]	Allowable Noise Increment	Existing Peak-Hour L_{eq}	Allowable Noise Increment
45	8	45	12
50	5	50	9
55	3	55	6
60	2	60	5
65	1	65	3
70	1	70	3
75	0	75	1
80	0	80	0

Noise levels are measured at the property line of the noise-sensitive use.

[a] *This category includes homes, hospitals, and hotels where a nighttime sensitivity to noise is assumed to be of utmost importance.*

[b] *This category includes schools, libraries, theaters, and churches where it is important to avoid interference with such activities as speech, meditation, and concentration on reading material.*

[c] *L_{dn} and CNEL levels are generally within 1 dBA; therefore, L_{dn} and CNEL levels are considered to be interchangeable for this noise analysis.*

Source: City of Escondido, Escondido General Plan Community Protection, May 2012.

City of Escondido Municipal Code

The City of Escondido Municipal Code, Chapter 17, Article 12, *Noise Abatement and Control* (hereafter referred to as the Noise Ordinance), establishes regulations regarding allowable increases in noise levels associated with operation and construction of the Project.

The Noise Ordinance establishes acceptable ambient sound levels to regulate intrusive noises (e.g., stationary mechanical equipment, amplified sound, and vehicles other than those traveling on public streets) within specific land use zones. For each of these zones, the Noise Ordinance states that exterior operational noise levels caused by Project-related sources shall not exceed the exterior sound limit levels identified in Table 6 on page 53, or the ambient noise

Table 6
City of Escondido Exterior Sound Level Limits

Zone	Time	Applicable Limit 1-Hour Average Sound Level (dBA)
Residential	7 A.M. to 10 P.M. 10 P.M. to 7 A.M.	50 45
Multi-Residential	7 A.M. to 10 P.M. 10 P.M. to 7 A.M.	55 50
Commercial	7 A.M. to 10 P.M. 10 P.M. to 7 A.M.	60 55
Light Industrial/Industrial Park	7 A.M. to 10 P.M. 10 P.M. to 7 A.M.	70
General Industrial	7 A.M. to 10 P.M. 10 P.M. to 7 A.M.	75

Source: City of Escondido Municipal Code, Section 17-229.

level, whichever is greater, when the ambient noise level is determined without the noise source operating.[40]

The Noise Ordinance provides restrictions regarding construction noise under Section 17-234 as follows:

a) It shall be unlawful for any person, including the City of Escondido, to operate construction equipment at any construction site, except on Monday through Friday during a week between the hours of seven (7) A.M. and six (6) P.M. and on Saturdays between the hours of nine (9) A.M. and five (5) P.M., and provided that the operation of such construction equipment complies with the requirements of subsection (d) of this section.

b) It shall be unlawful for any person, including the City of Escondido, to operate construction equipment at any construction site on Sundays and on days designated by the President, Governor or City Council as public holidays.

c) A person may operate construction equipment at his/her residence or for the purpose of constructing or modifying a residence for himself/herself on Monday through Friday of a week between the hours of seven (7) a.m. and

[40] *Ambient noise level is the existing background noise level at the time of measurement or prediction.*

six (6) p.m., and on Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays between the hours of nine (9) a.m. and five (5) p.m.; provided, that such operation of construction equipment is not carried on for profit or livelihood and complies with the requirements of subsection (d) of this section.

d) No construction equipment or combination of equipment, regardless of age or date of acquisition, shall be operated so as to cause noise in excess of a one-hour average sound level limit of seventy-five (75) dB at any time, unless a variance has been obtained in advance from the city manager.

e) Persons engaged in construction for profit or as a business shall post signs at conspicuous places on a construction site, indicating hours of work as prescribed by this article or authorized by permit and the applicable noise level limits.

Therefore, based on the thresholds provided in the General Plan and the noise level limits provided in the City's Noise Ordinance, the Project would result in a significant noise impact if:

- Construction-related noise levels exceed 75 dBA (L_{eq}) at the affected receptors;
- Project-related on-site stationary sources at noise-sensitive receptors exceed the City's exterior noise levels limits or the measured ambient noise levels, whichever is greater; or
- Project-related off-site traffic (generated during Project operations) increases the existing noise levels along roadway segments with sensitive receptors, which exceed the City's exterior incremental noise impacts standards (see Table 7 on page 55).

Existing Noise Environment

The Development Area is located within the existing shopping center site, as shown on Figure A-1 in Attachment A, Project Description, of this Initial Study. The nearest noise-sensitive (i.e., residential) uses to the Project Site are located along El Ku Avenue (to the northwest), along the west side of Del Lago Boulevard, and along the east side of Beethoven Drive south of Via Rancho Parkway (to the southeast).

Three noise receptor locations were selected to represent noise-sensitive uses nearest the Project Site, as shown on Figure 1 on page 56 and described in Table 7. Baseline ambient noise measurements at the three selected noise receptors were conducted on May 22, 2015, to quantify the existing noise environment at the noise-sensitive receptors in the vicinity of the

Table 7
Description of Noise Measurement Locations

Receptor Location	Description	Approximate Distance from Measurement Location to Project Site Boundary[a]
R1	Single-family residence at the cul-de-sac of El Ku Avenue, northwest of the Project Site	1,500 feet
R2	Single-family residence at the corner of Del Lago Boulevard and Avenida Magoria, west of the Project Site	1,900 feet
R3	Single-family residence at the corner of Beethoven Drive and Calle Montera, southeast of the Project Site	2,600 feet

[a] *Distances are estimated using Google Earth Map.*

Source: AES, 2015.

Project Site. The baseline noise monitoring program was conducted using a Quest Technologies Model 2900 Integrating/Logging Sound Level Meter.[41] At each of the noise receptor locations, two 15-minute measurements were conducted during the daytime hours (between 12 P.M. and 2 P.M.) and the nighttime hours (between 10 P.M. and 12:00 A.M.)

The results of the baseline sound measurement data are summarized in Table 8 on page 57. As indicated therein, the existing daytime ambient noise levels range from 62.2 dBA L_{eq} (at receptor R3) to 64.7 dBA L_{eq} (at receptor R1), while the measured nighttime ambient noise levels range from 47.5 dBA L_{eq} (at receptor R1) to 59.7 dBA L_{eq} (at receptor R2). The existing ambient noise levels at all off-site locations are above the City's exterior sound level limits of 50 and 45 dBA L_{eq} for daytime and nighttime hours, respectively. Therefore, the measured ambient noise levels are used as baseline measurements against which the Project's noise impacts are compared, per the City's Noise Ordinance.

Short-Term Construction Noise

Project construction is anticipated to occur over approximately 15 months, with completion anticipated in 2017. Construction would be completed in five main stages, including: (1) demolition; (2) site grading; (3) foundation; (4) building construction; and (5) paving/landscaping. This noise analysis conservatively assumed that up to 5,000 cubic

[41] *This sound meter meets and exceeds the minimum industry standard performance requirements for "Type 2" standard instruments as defined in the American National Standard Institute (ANSI) S1.4. It also meets the requirement specified in Section 17-227 of the EMC that instruments be "Type S2A" standard instruments or better. The sound meter was calibrated and operated according to the manufacturer's written specifications.*

eyestone ENVIRONMENTAL

Figure 1
Description of Nose Measurement Locations

Source: NAIP, 2014; Eyestone Environmental, 2015.

Table 8
Existing Ambient Noise Levels

Receptor Location	Measured Noise Levels, dBA L_{eq}		CNEL[a] (24-hour)
	Daytime Hours (7:00 A.M.–10:00 P.M.)	Nighttime Hours (10:00 P.M.–7:00 A.M.)	
R1	64.7	54.9	63.8
R2	63.4	59.7	65.4
R3	62.2	47.5	60.3

[a] *Estimated based on short-term (15-minute) noise measurement based on FTA procedures.*

Source: AES, 2015.

yards (cy) of soil would be exported from the Project Site during the site grading phase (actual export is estimated at approximately 300 cy). Haul trucks would travel between the Project Site and I-15 via Beethoven Drive and Via Rancho Parkway. In addition, noise from construction activities would be generated by vehicles and equipment during various stages, including demolition, site grading and excavation, and building foundation and construction. The noise levels created by construction equipment would vary depending on factors such as the type of equipment, the specific model, operating characteristics, and the condition of the equipment.

The Project's construction noise analysis is based on construction equipment noise levels published in the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Road Construction Noise Model.[42] Construction noise was analyzed using a typical construction equipment inventory consistent with the type of construction planned for the Project. The hourly average (L_{eq}) noise levels associated with each construction stage were calculated for the nearest noise-sensitive receptors surrounding the Project Site. These average noise levels are based on the quantity, type, and usage factors for each type of equipment that would be used during each construction stage and are typically attributable to multiple pieces of equipment operating simultaneously. The construction noise level at each of the receptor locations was calculated based on the standard point source noise-distance attenuation factor of 6.0 dBA for each doubling of distance.

Table 9 on page 58 provides the estimated construction noise levels at the three noise-sensitive receptors and a comparison with the noise impact criteria. As indicated therein, the

[42] *FHWA, Roadway Construction Noise Model User's Guide, 2005.*

Table 9
Construction Noise Impacts—On-Site Equipment

Receptor Location	Nearest Distance to Project Construction Site, (feet)	Estimated Construction Noise Levels by Project Construction Phase, dBA L_{eq}					Significance Threshold[a] dBA L_{eq}
		Demolition	Site Grading	Foundation	Building Construction	Paving	
R1	1,500	56.6	55.5	51.3	52.3	52.2	75
R2	1,900	44.5	43.5	39.2	40.2	40.1	75
R3	2,600	51.9	51.0	46.7	47.8	47.7	75

Source: AES, 2015.

estimated construction noise levels would be well below the 75-dBA significance threshold, as well as the existing daytime ambient noise levels at all analyzed off-site receptors. Therefore, noise impacts from project construction activities would be less than significant, and mitigation measures would not be required.

In addition to on-site construction noise sources, construction trucks for materials delivery and concrete mixing, haul trucks, and construction worker vehicles would require access to the Project Site during the construction phase. Of these, the The primary noise sources associated with off-site vehicles would be associated with delivery and haul trucks.

The peak period with the highest number of construction truck trips would occur during the site grading phase, when up to 63 haul trips (126 one-way trips) would occur. Based on an 8-hour construction day and a uniform distribution of trips, an estimated 16 one-way truck trips (8 arriving and 8 departing the site) per hour would occur during the grading phase. Noise levels generated by the Project-related haul trips were calculated using the FHWA Traffic Noise Model (TNM). The haul trucks would generate approximately 60 dBA L_{eq} along the anticipated haul routes, Beethoven Drive and Via Rancho Parkway, between the Project Site and I-15. Based on noise measurements at nearby roadways, the estimated noise levels from haul trucks would be lower than the existing ambient noise levels. In addition, there are no noise-sensitive uses (i.e., residences) along the haul route. Therefore, noise impacts from off-site construction traffic would be less than significant.

Long-Term Operational Noise

The existing noise environment in the Project vicinity is dominated by traffic noise from adjacent roadways, as well as nearby commercial and residential activities. Long-term operation of the Project would have a minimal effect on the noise environment in proximity to the Project Site, as it is located a substantial distance (minimum 1,500 feet) from existing

noise-sensitive uses. Noise generated by the Project would result primarily from building mechanical equipment, sound system within the theater, parking, and off-site traffic.

Fixed Mechanical Equipment

The operation of mechanical equipment such as air conditioners, pumps, fans, and related equipment may generate audible noise levels. The Project's mechanical equipment would be located at the building's rooftop. In addition, all mechanical equipment would be designed with appropriate noise control devices, such as sound screen/parapet walls and acoustical louvers, to comply with the noise limitation requirements set forth in the EMC. Therefore, the operation of mechanical equipment would not exceed the Project thresholds of significance, and impacts would be less than significant. As such, no mitigation measures would be required.

Movie Theater

The main noise source associated with operation of the proposed theater would be the amplified sound system used during movie showings. The theater sound system would generate an average sound level of approximately 85 dBA L_{eq}.[43] However, the theater audio sound level would be mostly contained within the theater screening rooms, as the theater building shell would provide a minimum 40-dBA noise reduction. The theater sound level would be further attenuated for off-site residential receptors by distance (i.e., a minimum of 1,500 feet away). Thus, the noise levels from theater operations would be below the measured ambient noise levels at the off-site residential receptors. Therefore, noise impacts associated with the theater operation would be less than significant.

Parking

Parking for the Project would be provided within the existing surface parking lots at the Westfield North County Shopping Center. Therefore, noise levels associated with the parking operations would be similar to the existing conditions. However, the Project would have later hours of operation than the existing shopping center. Therefore, there is a potential for increased noise due to the use of parking lots by moviegoers during the late night hours after the shopping center is closed.

Parking noise would include the activation of car alarms (on an intermittent basis), car horns, the slamming of car doors, engine revs, and tire squeals. Automobile movements would comprise the most continuous noise source and would generate a noise level of

[43] *Based on Dolby Laboratories and THX reference levels for cinema installations.*

approximately 65 dBA at a distance of 25 feet. Car alarm and horn noise events generate sound levels as high as 75 dBA at a reference distance of 25 feet.

The existing northern parking lot is approximately 500 feet from the nearest residential uses on El Ku Avenue (receptor R1). Based on distance attenuation, the maximum noise from automobile movement within the northern parking lot to receptor R1 would be reduced to a maximum noise level of 39 dBA (L_{max}), which would be well below the existing nighttime ambient noise level of 54.9 dBA (based on measured nighttime ambient noise levels at receptor R1). The intermittent noise from car alarms or horns would reach a noise level as high as 49 dBA (L_{max}), which also would be below the measured nighttime ambient noise level of 54.9 dBA (L_{eq}). Therefore, noise impacts associated with the Project parking operation would be less than significant.

Off-Site Traffic Noise

The Project is expected to generate a total of 1,682 daily trips, based on the Project's Traffic Study.[44] The Project-generated traffic noise impact was determined by evaluating the estimated increase in the existing ambient noise levels due to the addition of the Project-related traffic. Traffic noise levels at the off-site noise-sensitive receptors were calculated using the FHWA TNM and the Project's traffic volume data. As described above, L_{dn} and CNEL levels are generally within 1 dBA of each other. The City's land use compatibility guidelines are also provided in terms of CNEL. Therefore, Project traffic noise impacts are analyzed in terms of CNEL. The traffic noise prediction model calculates the hourly L_{eq} noise levels based on specific information including the hourly traffic volume, vehicle type mix, vehicle speed, and lateral distance between the noise receptor and the roadway. To calculate the 24-hour CNEL levels, the hourly L_{eq} levels were calculated during daytime hours (7:00 A.M. to 7:00 P.M.), evening hours (7:00 P.M. to 10:00 P.M.), and nighttime hours (10:00 P.M. to 7:00 A.M.).

Table 10 on page 61 provides a summary of the off-site traffic noise analysis. This table includes calculated CNEL noise levels for the analyzed roadway segments under the Existing, Existing Plus Project, Future Without Project, and Future With Project conditions. As shown in Table 10, Project traffic would result in a maximum increase of 0.2 dBA (CNEL) over future noise levels, which would occur along Beethoven Drive east of I-15. This increase is considered negligible in an exterior noise environment, as a minimum 3 dBA change in the noise environment is considered the threshold of human perception. At all other analyzed roadway segments, the noise increase due to Project-related traffic would be lower (0.1 dBA or less). Project traffic also would result in a maximum increase of 0.2 dBA (CNEL) over existing

[44] *Transportation Study for the Westfield North County Theater Project, Escondido, California, Gibson Transportation Consulting, Inc., 2015.*

Table 10
Off-Site Traffic Noise Impacts

Roadway Segment	Adjacent Land Use	Calculated Traffic Noise Levels,[a] dBA (CNEL)				Increase in Noise Levels, dBA (CNEL)		
		Existing (A)	Existing Plus Project (B)	Future (2035) No Project (C)	Future (2035) plus Project (D)	Project Impacts (D – C)	Project Impacts [Existing Plus Project] (B – A)	Cumulative Impacts (D – A)
Bear Valley Parkway								
– Between Sunset Dr. and Las Palmas Ave.	Residential	69.4	69.4	69.6	69.7	0.1	0.0	0.3
– Between Las Palmas Ave. and Canyon Rd.	Residential, School	69.6	69.7	69.4	69.5	0.1	0.1	-0.1
– Between Canyon Rd. and Mary Ln.	Residential, Church, Amphitheater	69.4	69.5	69.6	69.7	0.1	0.1	0.3
– Between Mary Ln. and San Pasqual Rd.	School, Ball field	68.9	69.0	68.9	69.0	0.1	0.1	0.1
– Between San Pasqual Rd. and Beethoven Dr.	Golf Course, Ballfield	70.3	70.4	70.5	70.5	0.0	0.1	0.2
Via Rancho Parkway								
– Between Beethoven Dr. and I-15 Fwy.	Commercial, Open space	68.1	68.1	67.5	67.5	0.0	0.0	-0.6
– Between Del Lago Blvd. and Quiet Hills Dr.	Residential	65.5	65.6	66.0	66.1	0.1	0.1	0.6
– Between Quiet Hills Dr. and Felicita Rd.	Residential	64.9	65.0	66.0	66.1	0.1	0.1	1.2
– West of Felicity Rd.	Residential	64.5	64.6	64.6	64.7	0.1	0.1	0.2

Table 10 (Continued)
Off-Site Traffic Noise Impacts

Roadway Segment	Adjacent Land Use	Calculated Traffic Noise Levels,[a] dBA (CNEL)				Increase in Noise Levels, dBA (CNEL)		
		Existing (A)	Existing Plus Project (B)	Future (2035) No Project (C)	Future (2035) plus Project (D)	Project Impacts (D – C)	Project Impacts [Existing Plus Project] (B – A)	Cumulative Impacts (D – A)
Beethoven Drive								
– East of I-15 Fwy.	Commercial, Park	64.2	64.3	64.3	64.5	0.2	0.1	0.3
– West of Via Rancho Pkwy.	Commercial Park	65.1	65.3	66.7	66.8	0.1	0.2	1.7
– East of Via Rancho Pkwy.		59.6	59.7	59.6	59.6	0.0	0.1	0.0
San Pasqual Road								
– East of Bear Valley Pkwy.	Residential, Golf Course	64.1	64.2	64.9	64.9	0.0	0.1	0.8
Del Lago Boulevard								
– Between I-15 Fwy. And Via Rancho Pkwy.	Residential, Commercial	62.3	62.5	63.5	63.6	0.1	0.2	1.3

[a] *Detailed calculation worksheets are included in Appendix D of this Initial Study.*

Source: AES, 2015.

noise levels, along both Beethoven Drive west of Via Rancho Parkway and Del Lago Boulevard between I-15 and Via Rancho Parkway. The estimated increase in noise levels from Project-generated off-site traffic would be below the significance threshold (i.e., a 1 dBA incremental increase for noise-sensitive uses with existing noise levels between 65 and 70 dBA L_{dn} or CNEL). Therefore, Project-level noise impact associated with off-site traffic would be less than significant.

As also shown in Table 10 on page 61, cumulative traffic, which takes into account ambient growth and related projects, would result in a maximum noise increase of 1.2, 1.3, and 1.7 dBA (CNEL) along Via Rancho Parkway between Quiet Hills Drive and Felicita Road, Del Lago Boulevard between I-15 and Via Rancho Parkway, and Beethoven Drive west of Via Rancho Parkway, respectively. The cumulative impacts along other roadways would be lower (i.e., 0.8 dBA or less). Although the incremental increase in cumulative noise levels at these roadway segments exceed the City's incremental noise limit of 2 dBA (where existing noise level exceed 60 dBA L_{dn} or CNEL) or 1 dBA (where existing noise levels are within 65 to 70 dBA CNEL), the Project's contribution to cumulative noise levels would be a maximum of 0.2 dBA (CNEL), which is less than the allowable increase (i.e., 1 dBA) and considered negligible in an outdoor environment. Therefore, the Project's contribution would not be cumulatively considerable. As such, cumulative noise impacts due to off-site traffic would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Less Than Significant Impact. The City uses specified vibration criteria from the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) for evaluating construction-related vibration impacts at nearby sensitive receptors. Table 11 on page 64 provides the FTA vibration criteria for human annoyance for various land uses. As indicated therein, the most stringent vibration impact criteria for sensitive (i.e., residential) uses is 72 Vibration dB (VdB).[45] Based on the FTA's published standard vibration velocities for construction equipment, the ground-borne vibration levels generated by typical construction equipment range from 58 VdB for a small bulldozer to 87 VdB for a large bulldozer or caisson drilling. The ground-borne vibration from a large bulldozer would attenuated to below the 72 VdB significance threshold at a distance of 80 feet from the equipment. As the nearest off-site residential receptor (receptor R1) is approximately

[45] *VdB = Vibration velocity level as measured in decibel reference to 1 micro-inches/second.*

Table 11
Federal Transit Administration Vibration Impact Criteria for Human Annoyance

Land Use Category	Ground-Borne Vibration Impacts Levels, VdB		
	Frequent Events[a]	Occasional Events[b]	Infrequent Events[c]
Category 1: Building where vibration would interfere with interior operations	65[d]	65[d]	65[d]
Category 2: Residences and buildings where people normally sleep	72	75	80
Category 3: Institutional land uses with primarily daytime uses	75	78	83

[a] *"Frequent Events" are defined as more than 70 vibration events of the same source per day.*

[b] *"Occasional Events" are defined as between 30 and 70 vibration events of the same source per day.*

[c] *"Infrequent Events" are defined as fewer than 30 vibration events of the same source per day.*

[d] *This criterion limit is based on the levels that are acceptable for most moderately sensitive equipment such as optical microscopes.*

Source: Federal Transit Administration, 2006.

1,500 feet away from the Project Site, the ground-borne vibration from Project construction equipment would be well below the significance threshold at the nearest off-site residential use. As such, ground-borne vibration impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

The Project's operational activities occurring outdoors would be limited to automobiles traveling within on-site parking lots, which would not generate excessive ground-borne noise or vibration. As such, ground-borne vibration and noise levels associated with the operation of the Project would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Less Than Significant Impact. Noise sources associated with the Project include outdoor mounted mechanical equipment, the indoor amplified sound system for the theater, parking, and off-site traffic movements. As discussed in Response to Checklist Question No. 12.a, off-site traffic attributable to the Project would have a less than significant impact on community noise levels. Noise levels associated with on-site operations (e.g., mechanical

equipment, amplified sound system, and parking) would also be less than significant, as detailed in Response to Checklist Question No. 12.a. As such, the Project would result in a less than significant permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity, and no mitigation measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Less than Significant Impact. Project construction activities would generate noise on a temporary basis and increase the existing ambient noise in the immediate vicinity of the Project Site. Construction-period noise impacts are discussed in Response to Checklist Question No. 12.a. As described therein, noise generated by on-site construction activities would be below the existing ambient noise levels at the off-site noise-sensitive receptors (receptors R1, R2, and R3) and the identified significance threshold. Therefore, the Project would not result in a significant impact with respect to a substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels, and no mitigation measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
e. 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 expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	☒

No Impact. There are no public airport within two miles of the Project Site. The nearest airport to the Project Site is the Ramona Airport, a general aviation airport located approximately nine miles southeast of the Project Site in the County of San Diego. Therefore, the Project would not expose people residing or working in the Project area to excessive noise levels associated with a public or public use airport. As such, no impacts would occur, and no mitigation measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	☒

No Impact. The Project Site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip, heliport or helistop. Therefore, the Project would not expose people to excessive noise levels associated with such operations, and no mitigation measures are required.

13. PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	☐	☒	☐	☐

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated. Paleontological resources are the fossilized remains of organisms that have lived in a region in the geologic past and whose remains are found in the accompanying geologic strata. This type of fossil record represents the primary source of information on ancient life forms, since the majority of species that have existed on earth from this area are extinct. Section 5097.5 of the PRC specifies that any unauthorized removal of paleontological remains is a misdemeanor. Further, the California Penal Code Section 622.5 sets the penalties for damage or removal of paleontological resources.

As described above, the Project Site and Development Area are located within an urbanized area and have been subject to ground disturbance in the past. However, the Project would require grading and excavation within the Development Area, and the possibility exists that paleontological artifacts that were not recovered during prior construction or other human activity, may be present. Thus, the following mitigation measure is recommended to ensure that the Project's potential impact on paleontological resources is addressed:

Mitigation Measure PAL 13-1: If any paleontological materials are encountered during the course of the Project development, work in the area shall be halted. The services of a qualified paleontologist shall be secured by contacting the San Diego Natural History Museum to assess the resources. In addition, a report on the paleontological findings shall be prepared by the qualified paleontologist and a copy of the paleontological report shall be submitted to the San Diego Natural History Museum.

Compliance with regulatory requirements and implementation of the above mitigation measure would ensure that Project impacts on any previously undiscovered paleontological resources would be less than significant.

There are no unique geologic features within or adjacent to the Project Site. Thus, no impacts associated with destruction of a unique geologic feature would not occur and no mitigation measures are required.

14. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project does not involve the development of residential uses. Therefore, the Project would not directly induce population growth within the Project area. However, construction of the Project would create temporary construction-related jobs. The work requirements of most construction projects are highly specialized such that construction workers remain at a job site only for the time in which their specific skills are needed to complete a particular phase of the construction process. Since it is unlikely that Project-related construction workers would relocate their place of residence as a consequence of working on the Project, the Project would not be anticipated to generate new permanent residents during construction.

Operation of the proposed theater would generate approximately six full-time (36 hours or more per week) and 50 to 55 part-time (average of 29 hours or less per week) net new employees within the Project Site. It is possible that some of these jobs would be filled by persons moving into the surrounding area, thereby generating a demand for housing. However, it is anticipated that much of this demand would be filled by existing vacancies in the housing market at the time. Therefore, the potential indirect population growth associated with Project employees who may relocate their place of residence is not anticipated to be substantial. As such, the Project would not result in a notable increase in demand for new housing. Any new demand, should it occur, would be minor in the context of forecasted growth for the City of Escondido. Furthermore, as the Project would be located in a developed area with an established network of roads and other urban infrastructure, it would not require the extension of such infrastructure in a manner that would indirectly induce substantial population growth. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒

No Impact. The Project would involve the construction of a theater building, outdoor pedestrian plaza, and Project signage within the existing regional shopping center. There are no housing units located within the Development Area or on the Project Site; thus, the Project would not displace any existing housing. Therefore, no impacts would occur, and no mitigation measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒

No Impact. As stated above, the Project Site and Development Area are is located within the existing regional shopping center, which does not contain any housing. Development of the Project would not cause the displacement of any persons that would necessitate the construction of housing elsewhere. Therefore, no impacts would occur, and no mitigation measures are required.

15. PUBLIC SERVICES. Will 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:

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a. Fire protection?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Less Than Significant. Fire protection services for the Project Site are provided by the Escondido Fire Department (EFD). Fire Station No. 4, located at 3301 Bear Valley Parkway, 1.1 miles northeast of the Project Site, is the closest fire station to the Project Site and houses one paramedic fire engine and one brush engine. Short-term Project construction activities and the staging of construction equipment would occur mainly within the Development Area. Partial lane closures adjacent to the Development Area may occur during construction activities. However, these closures would be temporary in nature. In the event of partial lane closures, both directions of travel on area roadways and access to the Project Site would be maintained. Further, emergency vehicle drivers have a variety of options for avoiding traffic, such as using their sirens to clear a path of travel or driving in the lanes of opposing traffic. In addition, Project construction activities would not impede access to other nearby uses. As such, Project construction would result in a less than significant impact with respect to fire protection services.

The Project would increase the daytime population of visitors to the shopping center within the Escondido Fire Department Fire Station No. 4 service area. Theater operation also would generate approximately six full-time (36 hours or more per week) and 50 to 55 part-time (average of 29 hours or less per week) net new employees within the Project Site. The increase in daytime visitor population and new employees would contribute to an increase in demand for fire protection services provided by Fire Station No. 4. A fire sprinkler system would be installed within the theater building, consistent with Fire code requirements, to reduce fire risks at the Project Site. The increase in demand for fire protection services would be offset by the public facility development fees paid to the City by the Applicant in accordance with Chapter 17, Article 18B of the EMC. In addition, the Project would be subject to fire building plan review to ensure compliance with current access and safety standards. Therefore, although the Project could increase demand on existing fire services and facilities, the Project is not anticipated to increase service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives to the extent that new or physically altered fire facilities are required. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
b. Police protection?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Less Than Significant. Police protection services in the Project vicinity are provided by the Escondido Police Department (EPD). The City is divided into four geographical districts: the North, South, East, and West Districts. The Project Site is located within the South District. Short-term Project construction activities and the staging of construction equipment would occur mainly within the Development Area. However, as mentioned above, construction of the Project may require minor work within adjacent streets. Therefore, partial lane closures adjacent to the Development Area may occur but would be temporary in nature. In the event of partial lane closures, both directions of travel on area roadways and access to the Project Site would be maintained. Further, emergency vehicle drivers have a variety of options for avoiding traffic, such as using their sirens to clear a path of travel or driving in the lanes of opposing traffic. In addition, Project construction activities would not impede access to other nearby uses. As such, Project construction would result in a less than significant impact with respect to police protection services.

The Project's commercial uses would increase the daytime visitor population of the shopping center within the Escondido Police Department South District service area. Operation of the theater also would also generate approximately six full-time (36 hours or more per week) and 50 to 55 part-time (average of 29 hours or less per week) net new employees within the Project Site. The increase in daytime visitor population and new employees would contribute to an increase in the demand for police protection services provided by the Escondido Police Department South District. However, the Project does not include residential uses and would not directly affect the existing officer to resident ratio or the crimes per resident ratio Citywide or within EPD's South District service area. Notwithstanding, to help reduce any on-site increase in demand for police services, the Project would implement comprehensive safety and security features to enhance public safety and reduce the demand for police services, including on-site security management during hours of operation, an alarm system, and closed-circuit cameras. The Project's alarm system would be monitored, and police would be dispatched only as needed. Existing security features on-site include security cameras and security staff that patrol the Project Site on the interior and exterior of the buildings 24-hours a day. Emergency access to the Project Site and surrounding uses would be maintained at all times. The additional traffic generated by the Project would not result in significant intersection impacts, as discussed further below in Section 16, Transportation/Traffic. Furthermore, Project traffic would not significantly impact emergency vehicle response times to the Project Site since the drivers of emergency vehicles typically have a variety of options for avoiding traffic, such as using their sirens to clear a path of travel or driving in the lanes of opposing traffic. Thus, Project-related traffic is not anticipated to impair EPD from responding to emergencies at

the Project Site or the surrounding area. Furthermore, the increase in demand for police protection services would be offset by the public facility development fees paid to the City by the Applicant in accordance with Chapter 17, Article 18B of the EMC. Therefore, the Project's potential impacts related to police protection services would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
c. Schools?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project includes the development of commercial uses. Development of new residential land uses, which directly generate school-aged children and a demand for school services, is not proposed. Thus, implementation of the Project would not result in a direct increase in the number of students within the service area of the Escondido Union School District (EUSD). In addition, the number of students indirectly generated by the Project would not be substantial since, as previously discussed, few employees are likely to relocate to the Project vicinity. Furthermore, pursuant to Senate Bill 50, the Applicant would be required to pay development fees to the EUSD prior to the issuance of building permits. Pursuant to Government Code Section 65995, the payment of these fees is considered full mitigation of Project-related school impacts. Therefore, impacts on schools would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are be required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
d. Parks?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Less Than Significant Impact. As previously described, the Project would involve the development of commercial uses. New residential land uses, which typically create the greatest demand for parks and recreational facilities, are not proposed. Thus, implementation of the Project would not result in on-site residents who would utilize nearby parks and/or recreational facilities. The Project would increase the daytime visitor population to the shopping center and generate approximately six full-time (36 hours or more per week) and 50 to 55 part-time (average of 29 hours or less per week) net new employees within the Project Site. As previously discussed, the new employment opportunities may be filled, likely in large part, by employees who already reside in the surrounding vicinity and currently utilize existing parks and recreational facilities in the area. Therefore, while the Project's employment opportunities could have the potential to indirectly increase the population of the City of Escondido, new demand for public parks and recreational facilities associated with Project development would be limited. Furthermore, pursuant to Chapter 6, Article 18C of the EMC,

the Applicant would be required to pay park and recreation facilities development fees prior to the issuance of building permits. Thus, impacts on parks and recreational facilities would be less than significant, and mitigation measures would not be required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
e. Other public facilities?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Less Than Significant Impact. As previously described, the Project would involve the development of commercial uses. New residential land uses, which typically create the greatest demand for library facilities, are not proposed. Thus, implementation of the Project would not result in on-site residents who would utilize nearby library facilities. The Project would increase the daytime visitor population to the shopping center and generate approximately six full-time (36 hours or more per week) and 50 to 55 part-time (average of 29 hours or less per week) net new employees within the Project Site. As previously discussed, the new employment opportunities generated by the Project may be filled, likely in large part, by employees who already reside in the vicinity of the Project Site and currently utilize existing library facilities. Furthermore, the increase in demand for library services would be offset by the public facility development fees paid to the City by the Applicant in accordance with Chapter 17, Article 18B of the EMC. Therefore, impacts on would be less than significant, and mitigation measures would not be required.

16. RECREATION.

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a. 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?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Less Than Significant Impact. As previously discussed, the Project would provide for new commercial uses; residential land uses, which typically generate the greatest demand for parks and recreational services, are not proposed. Thus, implementation of the Project would not generate on-site residents who would utilize nearby neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities. The Project would, however, increase the visitor population at the shopping center and generate new employees within the Project Site. As discussed in Response to Checklist Question No. 13.a, operation of the proposed theater would generate approximately six full-time (36 hours or more per week) and 50 to 55 part-time (average of 29 hours or less per week) net new employees within the Project Site. However, the new employment opportunities likely would be filled, in large part, by people who already reside in the Project vicinity and utilize existing parks and recreational facilities. Accordingly, any increase in the use of parks and recreational facilities as a result of the Project would be nominal. Furthermore, pursuant to Chapter 6, Article 18C of the EMC, the Applicant would be required to pay park and recreation facilities development fees prior to the issuance of building permits. As such, the Project would not increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that a substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated. Thus, impacts on parks and recreational facilities would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
b. 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

No Impact. As discussed in detail in Attachment A, Project Description, the Project would include the construction of a 50,341-square-foot theater, an outdoor pedestrian plaza, and Project signage within the Development Area. Recreational facilities are not proposed as part of the Project. Therefore, no impact would occur, and no mitigation measures are required.

17. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:

The following discussion is based on the Traffic Study provided as Appendix E of this Initial Study. More specifically, the *Transportation Study for the Westfield North County Theater Project* (Traffic Study) was prepared by Gibson Transportation Consulting, Inc., dated September 2015 in accordance with the methodologies and guidelines set forth by the San Diego Traffic Engineers' Council (SANTEC) and the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) *SANTEC/ITE Guidelines for Traffic Impact Studies in the San Diego Region* (SANTEC/ITE Guidelines) and the *City of Escondido Traffic Impact Analysis Guideline* (City Guideline).[46]

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a. Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Less Than Significant Impact. Operation of the proposed theater has the potential to increase peak-hour traffic in the Project vicinity. In addition, Project construction has the potential to increase traffic through the hauling of excavated materials and debris, the transport of construction equipment, the delivery of construction materials, and travel by construction workers to and from the Project Site. An analysis of potential impacts associated with operation and construction of the Project is provided below.

The following 17 intersections, three of which are freeway ramp locations under Caltrans jurisdiction, and 14 street segments are analyzed in the Traffic Study:

[46] *San Diego Traffic Engineers' Council and Institute of Transportation Engineers, SANTEC/ITE Guidelines for Traffic Impact Studies in the San Diego Region, March 2000; City of Escondido, City of Escondido Traffic Impact Analysis Guideline, October 10, 2013.*

Intersections

1. Bear Valley Parkway & Sunset Drive
2. Bear Valley Parkway & Las Palmas Avenue
3. Bear Valley Parkway & Canyon Road
4. Bear Valley Parkway & Entrance Drive/Mary Lane
5. Bear Valley Parkway & San Pasqual Road
6. I-15 NB/SB HOV Ramps & Beethoven Drive/Del Lago Boulevard
7. Driveway #1 & Beethoven Drive
8. Driveway #2 & Beethoven Drive
9. Driveway #3 & Beethoven Drive
10. Driveway #4 & Beethoven Drive
11. Driveway #5 & Beethoven Drive
12. Via Rancho Parkway & Felicita Road/Quiet Hills Drive
13. Via Rancho Parkway & Quiet Hills Drive/Camino Del Postigo
14. Via Rancho Parkway & Del Lago Boulevard/I-15 SB Ramps
15. Via Rancho Parkway & Driveway #6/I-5 NB Ramps
16. Via Rancho Parkway & Driveway #7/Sunset Drive
17. Via Rancho Parkway/Bear Valley Parkway & Beethoven Drive

Street Segments

1. Bear Valley Parkway between Sunset Drive/Ranchito Drive & Las Palmas Avenue
2. Bear Valley Parkway between Las Palmas Avenue & Canyon Road
3. Bear Valley Parkway between Canyon Road & Entrance Drive/Mary Lane
4. Bear Valley Parkway between Entrance Drive/Mary Lane & San Pasqual Road

5. Bear Valley Parkway between San Pasqual Road & Beethoven Drive
6. Beethoven Drive East of Interstate-15
7. Beethoven Drive West of Via Rancho Parkway/Bear Valley Parkway
8. Via Rancho Parkway West of Felicita Road/Quiet Hills Drive
9. Via Rancho Parkway between Felicita Road/Quiet Hills Drive & Quiet Hills Drive/ Camino del Postigo
10. Via Rancho Parkway between Quiet Hills Drive/Camino del Postigo & Del Lago Boulevard/Interstate-15 Southbound Ramps
11. Via Rancho Parkway between Del Lago Boulevard/Interstate-15 Southbound Ramps & Driveway #6/Interstate-15 Northbound Ramps
12. Via Rancho Parkway between Driveway #6/Interstate-15 Northbound Ramps & Driveway #7/Sunset Drive
13. Via Rancho Parkway between Driveway #7/Sunset Drive & Beethoven Drive
14. San Pasqual Road East of Bear Valley Parkway

The Project would generate 1,682 net new daily trips on a typical weekday, including approximately six morning peak-hour trips (five inbound, one out bound) and 135 afternoon peak-hour trips (81 inbound, 54 outbound). Due to the low net new trip generation, the morning peak hour was not evaluated further for Project impacts.

The Project was analyzed under three different scenarios. In accordance with CEQA, an Existing plus Project scenario was evaluated at the study intersections and street segments to identify the potential incremental impacts of the Project, prior to mitigation, on current traffic conditions by adding the Project-generated traffic to the existing (year 2015) traffic volumes. In addition, the Near Term Cumulative with Project Conditions (year 2018) analysis identifies the potential incremental impacts of the Project on projected near-future traffic conditions, prior to mitigation, by adding Project-generated traffic to the Near Term Cumulative without Project (year 2018) traffic forecasts. Although Project buildout may occur as early as 2017, the analysis projections are based on the first full year of Project operations, which is anticipated to occur in 2018. Further, the Horizon Year: Future with Project Conditions identifies the potential incremental impacts of the Project on projected long-term traffic conditions, prior to mitigation, by adding the Project-generated traffic to the Horizon Year without Project (year 2035) traffic forecasts. The analysis year of 2035 corresponds with the horizon year of the City's General Plan.

Per City policy, the Project would have a significant impact if an intersection or street segment exceeds the thresholds contained in Table 12 on page 79.

Operational Traffic

Intersection Level of Service

The City of Escondido uses Level of Service (LOS) to describe the operating condition of intersections. As set forth in Table 13 on page 79, the 2010 Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) methodology determines the average stopped delay experience per vehicle (measured in seconds) and corresponding LOS for the turning movements and intersection characteristics at signalized intersections.[47]

Table 14, Table 15, and Table 16 on pages 80, 81, and 82 summarize intersection operations during Existing with Project Conditions, Near Term Cumulative with Project Conditions, and Horizon Year with Project Conditions, respectively. As shown therein, all but one of the analyzed intersections are projected to operate at an acceptable LOS D or better during the afternoon peak hour under all three scenarios. Via Rancho Parkway & I-15 Northbound Ramps/Driveway #6 is projected to operate at LOS E during the afternoon peak hour under Existing with Project Conditions, Near Term with Project Conditions, and Horizon Year with Project Conditions. However, the Project's traffic increment would not exceed the City's significance thresholds. Thus, the Project is not anticipated to result in a significant impact under the Existing plus Project, Near Term Cumulative with Project, or Horizon Year with Project Conditions, and no mitigation measures are required.

Street Segment Level of Service

The City requires a daily street segment analysis to evaluate street segment operations. This analysis is based on capacity thresholds identified in the City Guideline, shown in Table 17 on page 83. The 2010 HCM methodology determines the LOS for street segments using average travel speeds based on the definitions described in Table 18 on page 83.

Street Segments—Daily Analysis

Table 19, Table 20, and Table 21 on pages 84, 85 and 86 summarize daily street segment operations during Existing with Project Conditions, Near Term Cumulative with Project Conditions, and Horizon Year with Project Conditions, respectively. As shown in Table 19 and Table 20, 12 of the 14 analyzed street segments are projected to operate at

[47] *Transportation Research Board, 2010 Highway Capacity Manual, 2010.*

Table 12
City of Escondido Proposed Thresholds to Identify Project Significant Impact

Level of Service With Project	Allowable Change due to Project Impacts		
	Roadway Segments		Intersections
	V/C	Speed Reduction (mph)	Delay (sec.)
D, E, or F	0.02	1	2

Source: City of Escondido Traffic Impact Analysis Guideline, October 10, 2013.

Table 13
Level of Service Definitions for Signalized Intersections 2010 Highway Capacity Manual Operations Methodology

With Project Traffic LOS	Average Control Delay per Vehicle (seconds)
A	≤ 10.0
B	>10.0 and ≤ 20.0
C	>20.0 and ≤ 35.0
D	>35.0 and ≤ 55.0
E	>55.0 and ≤ 80.0
F	>80.0

Source: Transportation Research Board, 2010 Highway Capacity Manual, 2010.

LOS D or better under Existing with Project Conditions and Near Term Cumulative with Project Conditions. The segments of Bear Valley Parkway between Sunset Drive/Ranchito Drive and Las Palmas Avenue and between San Pasqual Road and Beethoven Drive are both projected to operate at LOS F under Existing with Project Conditions and Near Term Cumulative with Project Conditions. As shown in Table 21 on page 86, 11 of the 14 analyzed street segments are projected to operate at LOS D or better under Horizon Year with Project Conditions. The segments of Bear Valley Parkway between Sunset Drive/Ranchito Drive and Las Palmas Avenue and between San Pasqual Road and Beethoven Drive and the segment of Via Rancho Parkway between Del Lago Boulevard/I-15 Southbound Ramps and I-15 Northbound Ramps/Driveway #6 is projected to operate at LOS E or F under Horizon Year with Project Conditions. However, the Project's traffic increment would not exceed the City's significance thresholds and thus would not result in a significant impact under the Existing plus Project, Near Term Cumulative with Project, or Horizon Year with Project Conditions. Thus, no mitigation measures are required.

Table 14
Existing With Project Conditions (Year 2015)—Intersection Peak-Hour Levels of Service

Intersection	Peak Hour	Existing Conditions		Existing Plus Project Conditions			
		Delay	LOS[a]	Delay	LOS[a]	Change in Delay	Signif. Impact?
1. Bear Valley Pkwy. & Sunset Dr./Ranchito Dr.	P.M.	27.17	C	27.61	C	0.44	No
2. Bear Valley Pkwy. & Las Palmas Ave.	P.M.	7.20	A	7.17	A	(0.03)	No
3. Bear Valley Pkwy. & Canyon Rd.	P.M.	5.69	A	5.91	A	0.22	No
4. Bear Valley Pkwy. & Entrance Dr./Mary Lane	P.M.	13.76	B	13.81	B	0.05	No
5. Bear Valley Pkwy. & San Pasqual Rd.	P.M.	16.95	B	17.06	B	0.11	No
6. I-15 NB/SB HOV Ramps & Beethoven Dr./Del Lago Blvd.	P.M.	9.96	A	10.06	B	0.10	No
7. Driveway #1 & Beethoven Dr.[b]	P.M.	17.35	B	18.21	B	0.86	No
8. Driveway #2 & Beethoven Dr.[b]	P.M.	14.22	B	15.11	B	0.89	No
9. Driveway #3 & Beethoven Dr.[b]	P.M.	15.65	B	16.37	B	0.72	No
10. Driveway #4 & Beethoven Dr.[b]	P.M.	14.15	B	14.73	B	0.58	No
11. Driveway #5 & Beethoven Dr.[b]	P.M.	11.98	B	12.38	B	0.40	No
12. Via Rancho Pkwy. & Felicita Rd./Quiet Hills Dr.	P.M.	10.68	B	10.70	B	0.02	No
13. Via Rancho Pkwy. & Quiet Hills Dr./Camino Del Postigo	P.M.	6.62	A	6.83	A	0.21	No
14. Via Rancho Pkwy. & Del Lago Blvd./I-15 SB Ramps	P.M.	47.86	D	49.28	D	1.42	No
15. Via Rancho Pkwy. & Driveway #6/I-5 NB Ramps	P.M.	78.48	E	78.35	E	(0.13)	No
16. Via Rancho Pkwy. & Driveway #7/Sunset Dr.	P.M.	36.64	D	36.61	D	(0.03)	No
17. Via Rancho Pkwy./Bear Valley Pkwy. & Beethoven Dr.	P.M.	23.04	C	23.30	C	0.26	No

[a] *LOS Analysis is based on 2010 HCM methodology.*

[b] *Intersection is stop-controlled, delayed reported is for minor street left turn lane.*

Source: Gibson Transportation Consulting, Inc., 2015.

Table 15
Near Term Cumulative With Project Conditions (Year 2018)—Intersection P.M. Peak-Hour Levels of Service

Intersection	Near Term Cumulative Without Project Conditions		Near Term Cumulative Plus Project Conditions			
	Delay	LOS[a]	Delay	LOS[a]	Change in Delay	Signif. Impact?
1. Bear Valley Pkwy. & Sunset Dr./ Ranchito Dr.	27.63	C	28.09	C	0.46	No
2. Bear Valley Pkwy. & Las Palmas Ave.	7.65	A	7.61	A	(0.04)	No
3. Bear Valley Pkwy. & Canyon Rd.	5.69	A	5.86	A	0.17	No
4. Bear Valley Pkwy. & Entrance Dr./ Mary Ln.	13.76	B	13.81	B	0.05	No
5. Bear Valley Pkwy. & San Pasqual Rd.	16.95	B	17.06	B	0.11	No
6. I-15 NB/SB HOV Ramps & Beethoven Dr./Del Lago Blvd.	9.96	A	10.06	B	0.10	No
7. Driveway #1 & Beethoven Dr.[b]	17.35	B	18.21	B	0.86	No
8. Driveway #2 & Beethoven Dr.[b]	14.22	B	15.11	B	0.89	No
9. Driveway #3 & Beethoven Dr.[b]	15.65	B	16.37	B	0.72	No
10. Driveway #4 & Beethoven Dr.[b]	14.15	B	14.73	B	0.58	No
11. Driveway #5 & Beethoven Dr.[b]	11.98	B	12.38	B	0.40	No
12. Via Rancho Pkwy. & Felicita Rd./Quiet Hills Dr.	10.68	B	10.70	B	0.02	No
13. Via Rancho Pkwy. & Quiet Hills Dr./ Camino Del Postigo	6.62	A	6.83	A	0.21	No
14. Via Rancho Pkwy. & Del Lago Blvd./I-15 SB Ramps	47.86	D	49.28	D	1.42	No
15. Via Rancho Pkwy. & Driveway #6/I-5 NB Ramps	78.48	E	78.35	E	(0.13)	No
16. Via Rancho Pkwy. & Driveway #7/ Sunset Dr.	36.64	D	36.61	D	(0.03)	No
17. Via Rancho Pkwy./Bear Valley Pkwy. & Beethoven Dr.	23.04	C	23.30	C	0.26	No

[a] *LOS analysis is based on 2010 HCM methodology.*

[b] *Intersection is stop-controlled; delayed reported is for minor street left turn lane.*

Source: Gibson Transportation Consulting, Inc., 2015.

Table 16
Horizon Year With Project Conditions (Year 2035)—Intersection P.M. Peak-Hour Levels of Service

Intersection	Horizon Year Without Project Conditions		Horizon Year Plus Project Conditions			
	Delay	LOS[a]	Delay	LOS[a]	Change in Delay	Signif. Impact?
1. Bear Valley Pkwy. & Sunset Dr./ Ranchito Dr.	25.57	C	25.74	C	0.17	No
2. Bear Valley Pkwy. & Las Palmas Ave.	8.50	A	8.43	A	(0.07)	No
3. Bear Valley Pkwy. & Canyon Rd.	7.40	A	7.56	A	0.16	No
4. Bear Valley Pkwy. & Entrance Dr./ Mary Ln.	21.14	C	21.02	C	(0.12)	No
5. Bear Valley Pkwy. & San Pasqual Rd.	14.05	B	14.13	B	0.08	No
6. I-15 NB/SB HOV Ramps & Beethoven Dr./Del Lago Blvd.	18.03	B	17.96	B	(0.07)	No
7. Driveway #1 & Beethoven Dr.[b]	12.58	B	13.03	B	0.45	No
8. Driveway #2 & Beethoven Dr.[b]	10.85	B	11.68	B	0.83	No
9. Driveway #3 & Beethoven Dr.[b]	12.94	B	13.42	B	0.48	No
10. Driveway #4 & Beethoven Dr.[b]	12.26	B	12.79	B	0.53	No
11. Driveway #5 & Beethoven Dr.[b]	10.87	B	11.14	B	0.27	No
12. Via Rancho Pkwy. & Felicita Rd./Quiet Hills Dr.	8.39	A	8.63	A	0.24	No
13. Via Rancho Pkwy. & Quiet Hills Dr./ Camino Del Postigo	10.25	B	10.33	B	0.08	No
14. Via Rancho Pkwy. & Del Lago Blvd./I-15 SB Ramps	44.77	D	44.89	D	0.12	No
15. Via Rancho Pkwy. & Driveway #6/I-5 NB Ramps	79.91	E	79.81	E	(0.10)	No
16. Via Rancho Pkwy. & Driveway #7/ Sunset Dr.	43.75	D	43.66	D	(0.09)	No
17. Via Rancho Pkwy./Bear Valley Pkwy. & Beethoven Dr.	24.34	C	24.61	C	0.27	No

[a] *LOS analysis is based on 2010 HCM methodology.*

[b] *Intersection is stop-controlled; delayed reported is for minor street left turn lane.*

Source: Gibson Transportation Consulting, Inc., 2015.

Table 17
Level of Service Definitions for Street Segments—Average Daily Traffic City of Escondido Guidelines

Street Classification	Lanes	LOS with ADT[a]				
		A	B	C	D	E
Prime Arterial	8 Lanes	23,800	37,800	51,800	62,300	70,000
	6 Lanes	20,400	32,400	44,400	53,400	60,000
Major Road	6 Lanes	17,000	27,000	37,000	44,500	50,000
	4 Lanes	12,600	20,000	27,400	32,900	37,000
Collector	4 Lanes	11,600	185,000	25,300	30,400	34,200
	4 Lanes	6,800	108,000	14,800	17,800	20,000
Local Collector	2 Lanes	5,100	8,100	11,100	13,400	15,000
	2 Lanes	3,400	5,400	7,400	8,900	10,000

[a] *Approximate recommended ADT based upon the City of Escondido Traffic Impact Analysis Guideline.*

Source: Gibson Transportation Consulting, Inc., 2015.

Table 18
Level of Service Definitions for Street Segments (Peak Hour) 2010 Highway Capacity Manual Operations Methodology

Travel Speed as a Percentage of Base Free-Flow Speed (%)	LOS by Critical Volume-to-Capacity Ratio ≤ 1.0
>85	<10.0
>67–85	>10.0 and <20.0
>50–67	>20.0 and <35.0
>40–50	>35.0 and <55.0
>30–40	>55.0 and <80.0
≥30	>80.0

Source: Highway Capacity Manual, Transportation Research Board, 2010; Gibson Transportation Consulting, Inc., 2015.

Table 19
Existing With Project Conditions (Year 2015)—Street Segment Daily Levels of Service

Street Segment	Classification	Lanes	Capacity at LOS E	Existing Conditions			Existing Plus Project Conditions				
				ADT	V/C	LOS	ADT	V/C	LOS	Change in V/C	Signif. Impact?
1. Bear Valley Pkwy. between Sunset Dr./Ranchito Dr. & Las Palmas Ave.	Major Road	2	15,000	24,046	1.603	F	24,298	1.620	F	0.017	No
2. Bear Valley Pkwy. between Las Palmas Ave. & Canyon Rd.	Super Major Road	4	37,000	26,810	0.725	C	27,062	0.731	C	0.007	No
3. Bear Valley Pkwy. between Canyon Rd. & Entrance Dr./Mary Ln.	Super Major Road	4	37,000	24,272	0.656	C	24,608	0.665	C	0.009	No
4. Bear Valley Pkwy. between Entrance Dr./Mary Ln. & San Pasqual Rd.	Super Major Road	4	37,000	28,756	0.777	D	29,143	0.788	D	0.010	No
5. Bear Valley Pkwy. between San Pasqual Rd. & Beethoven Dr.	Super Major Road	4	37,000	39,437	1.066	F	39,992	1.081	F	0.015	No
6. Beethoven Dr. East of I-15	Collector	3	22,500	8,707	0.387	B	9,043	0.402	B	0.015	No
7. Beethoven Dr. West of Via Rancho Pkwy./Bear Valley Pkwy.[a]	Collector	4	34,200	10,881	0.318	A	11,302	0.330	B	0.019	No
	Collector	3	2,500	10,881	0.484	B	11,302	0.502	A	0.012	No
8. Via Rancho Pkwy. West of Felicita Rd./Quiet Hills Dr.	Collector	2	15,000	9,391	0.626	C	9,610	0.641	C	0.015	No
9. Via Rancho Pkwy. between Felicita Rd./Quiet Hills Dr. & Quiet Hills Dr./Camino del Postigo	Major Road	5	37,000	10,996	0.297	A	11,299	0.305	A	0.008	No
10. Via Rancho Pkwy. between Quiet Hills Dr./Camino del Postigo & Del Lago Boulevard/I-15 SB Ramps	Super Prime Arterial	6	60,000	12,749	0.212	A	13,102	0.218	A	0.006	No
11. Via Rancho Pkwy. between Del Lago Boulevard/I-15 SB Ramps & Driveway #6/I-15 NB Ramps	Major Road	4	37,000	29,393	0.794	D	29,814	0.806	D	0.011	No
12. Via Rancho Pkwy. between Driveway #6/I-15 NB Ramps & Driveway #7/Sunset Dr.	Super Prime Arterial	7	60,000	35,575	0.593	C	35,659	0.594	C	0.001	No
13. Via Rancho Pkwy. between Driveway #7/Sunset Dr. & Beethoven Dr.	Super Prime Arterial	7	60,000	33,341	0.556	C	33,509	0.558	C	0.003	No
14. San Pasqual Rd. East of Bear Valley Pkwy.	Major Road	4	37,000	12,566	0.340	A	12,734	0.344	B	0.005	No

[a] *Segment has 3- and 4-lane cross-sections.*

Source: Gibson Transportation Consulting, Inc., 2015.

Table 20
Near Term Cumulative With Project Conditions (Year 2018)—Street Segment Daily Levels of Service

Street Segment	Classification	Lanes	Capacity at LOS E	Near Term Cumulative Without Project Conditions			Near Term Cumulative Plus Project Conditions				
				ADT	V/C	LOS	ADT	V/C	LOS	Change in V/C	Signif. Impact?
1. Bear Valley Pkwy. between Sunset Dr./Ranchito Dr. & Las Palmas Ave.	Major Road	2	15,000	24,239	1.616	F	24,491	1.633	F	0.017	No
2. Bear Valley Pkwy. between Las Palmas Ave. & Canyon Rd.	Super Major Road	4	37,000	26,975	0.729	C	27,227	0.736	C	0.007	No
3. Bear Valley Pkwy. between Canyon Rd. & Entrance Dr./Mary Ln.	Super Major Road	4	37,000	24,437	0.660	C	24,773	0.670	C	0.009	No
4. Bear Valley Pkwy. between Entrance Dr./Mary Ln. & San Pasqual Rd.	Super Major Road	4	37,000	28,921	0.782	D	29,308	0.792	D	0.010	No
5. Bear Valley Pkwy. between San Pasqual Rd. & Beethoven Dr.	Super Major Road	4	37,000	39,437	1.066	F	39,992	1.081	F	0.015	No
6. Beethoven Dr. East of I-15	Collector	3	22,500	8,707	0.387	B	9,043	0.402	B	0.015	No
7. Beethoven Dr. West of Via Rancho Pkwy./Bear Valley Pkwy.[a]	Collector Collector	4 3	34,200 22,500	10,881 10,881	0.318 0.484	A B	11,302 11,302	0.330 0.502	A B	0.012 0.019	No No
8. Via Rancho Pkwy. West of Felicita Rd./Quiet Hills Dr.	Collector	2	15,000	9,391	0.626	C	9,610	0.641	C	0.015	No
9. Via Rancho Pkwy. between Felicita Rd./Quiet Hills Dr. & Quiet Hills Dr./Camino del Postigo	Major Road	5	37,000	10,996	0.297	A	11,299	0.305	A	0.008	No
10. Via Rancho Pkwy. between Quiet Hills Dr./Camino del Postigo & Del Lago Boulevard/I-15 SB Ramps	Super Prime Arterial	6	60,000	12,749	0.212	A	13,102	0.218	A	0.006	No
11. Via Rancho Pkwy. between Del Lago Boulevard/I-15 SB Ramps & Driveway #6/I-15 NB Ramps	Major Road	4	37,000	29,393	0.794	D	29,814	0.806	D	0.011	No
12. Via Rancho Pkwy. between Driveway #6/I-15 NB Ramps & Driveway #7/Sunset Dr.	Super Prime Arterial	7	60,000	35,575	0.593	C	35,659	0.594	C	0.001	No
13. Via Rancho Pkwy. between Driveway #7/Sunset Dr. & Beethoven Dr.	Super Prime Arterial	7	60,000	33,341	0.556	C	33,509	0.558	C	0.003	No
14. San Pasqual Rd. East of Bear Valley Pkwy.	Major Road	4	37,000	12,566	0.340	A	12,734	0.344	B	0.005	No

[a] *Segment has 3- and 4-lane cross-sections.*

Source: Gibson Transportation Consulting, Inc., 2015.

Table 21
Horizon Year With Project Conditions (Year 2035)—Street Segment Daily Levels of Service

Street Segment	Classification	Lanes	Capacity at LOS E	Horizon Year Without Project Conditions			Horizon Year Plus Project Conditions				
				ADT	V/C	LOS	ADT	V/C	LOS	Change in V/C	Signif. Impact?
1. Bear Valley Pkwy. between Sunset Dr./Ranchito Dr. & Las Palmas Ave.	Major Road	2	15,000	25,448	1.697	F	25,700	1.713	F	0.017	No
2. Bear Valley Pkwy. between Las Palmas Ave. & Canyon Rd.	Super Major Road	4	37,000	25,448	0.688	C	25,700	0.695	C	0.007	No
3. Bear Valley Pkwy. between Canyon Rd. & Entrance Dr./Mary Ln.	Super Major Road	4	37,000	25,564	0.691	C	25,900	0.700	C	0.009	No
4. Bear Valley Pkwy. between Entrance Dr./Mary Ln. & San Pasqual Rd.	Super Major Road	4	37,000	28,613	0.773	D	29,000	0.784	D	0.010	No
5. Bear Valley Pkwy. between San Pasqual Rd. & Beethoven Dr.	Super Major Road	4	37,000	40,745	1.101	F	41,300	1.116	F	0.015	No
6. Beethoven Dr. East of I-15	Collector	3	22,500	9,064	0.403	B	9,400	0.418	B	0.015	No
7. Beethoven Dr. West of Via Rancho Pkwy./Bear Valley Pkwy.[a]	Collector Collector	4 3	34,200 22,500	15,479 15,479	0.453 0.688	A B	15,900 15,900	0.465 0.707	B C	0.012 0.019	No No
8. Via Rancho Pkwy. West of Felicita Rd./Quiet Hills Dr.	Collector	2	15,000	9,681	0.645	C	9,900	0.660	C	0.015	No
9. Via Rancho Pkwy. between Felicita Rd./Quiet Hills Dr. & Quiet Hills Dr./Camino del Postigo	Major Road	5	37,000	14,197	0.384	A	14,500	0.392	B	0.008	No
10. Via Rancho Pkwy. between Quiet Hills Dr./Camino del Postigo & Del Lago Boulevard/I-15 SB Ramps	Super Prime Arterial	6	60,000	14,147	0.236	A	14,500	0.242	A	0.006	No
11. Via Rancho Pkwy. between Del Lago Boulevard/I-15 SB Ramps & Driveway #6/I-15 NB Ramps	Major Road	4	37,000	36,379	0.983	D	36,800	0.995	E	0.011	No
12. Via Rancho Pkwy. between Driveway #6/I-15 NB Ramps & Driveway #7/Sunset Dr.	Super Prime Arterial	7	60,000	29,216	0.487	C	29,300	0.488	B	0.001	No
13. Via Rancho Pkwy. between Driveway #7/Sunset Dr. & Beethoven Dr.	Super Prime Arterial	7	60,000	29,132	0.486	C	29,300	0.488	B	0.003	No
14. San Pasqual Rd. East of Bear Valley Pkwy.	Major Road	4	37,000	14,832	0.401	A	15,000	0.405	B	0.005	No

[a] *Segment has 3- and 4-lane cross-sections.*

Source: Gibson Transportation Consulting, Inc., 2015.

Street Segments—Peak Hour Analysis

The street segment peak-hour analysis was conducted for all of the study street segments under Existing with Project Conditions, Near Term Cumulative with Project Conditions, and Horizon Year with Project Conditions. As shown in Table 22 on page 88, under Existing with Project Conditions, eight of the 10 analyzed street segments are projected to operate at LOS D or better during the afternoon peak hour in both directions. The segments of Via Rancho Parkway between I-15 Northbound Ramps/Driveway #6 and Driveway #7/Sunset Drive and between Driveway #7/Sunset Drive and Beethoven Drive (in one direction each) would operate at LOS E during the afternoon peak hour under Existing with Project Conditions. Table 23 on page 89 shows that all but one of the 10 analyzed street segments are projected to operate at LOS D or better during the afternoon peak hour under Near Term Cumulative Project Conditions. The westbound direction of Via Rancho Parkway between I-15 Northbound Ramps/Driveway #6 and Driveway #7/Sunset Drive is projected to operate at LOS E during the afternoon peak hour under Near Term Cumulative with Project Conditions. As shown in Table 24 on page 90 all 10 analyzed street segments are projected to operate at LOS D or better during the afternoon peak hour in both directions. However, as summarized in Table 22, Table 23, and Table 24, the Project's traffic increment would not exceed the City's thresholds of significance under the Existing plus Project, Near Term Cumulative with Project, or Horizon Year with Project Conditions. Thus, no mitigation measures are required.

Freeway Ramps

The only study area freeway on-ramp that is metered during the afternoon peak hour is the I-15 Northbound On-Ramp at Via Rancho Parkway. Table 25 on page 91 shows that under Existing with Project Conditions, this ramp would have an excess demand of 164 vehicles per hour, resulting in a delay of 23.15 minutes and a queue of 4,756 feet. Similarly, under Near Term Cumulative with Project Conditions, the ramp would have an excess demand of 164 vehicles per hour, resulting in a delay of 23.15 minutes and a queue of 4,756 feet. Under Horizon Year with Project Conditions, the ramp is projected to have an excess demand of 204 vehicles per hour, resulting in a delay of 28.80 minutes and a queue of 5,916 feet. However, the change in delay resulting from Project traffic would be 1.69 minutes under all three scenarios, which would not be significant. Thus, the Project is not anticipated to result in a significant impact under the Existing with Project, Near Term Cumulative with Project, or Horizon Year with Project Conditions. Thus, no mitigation measures are required.

Transit and Bicycle Facilities

Transit service in the Project vicinity is provided by North County Transit District (NCTD) and Metropolitan Transit System (MTS). The Project Site is served by NCTD Route 350 and MTS Routes 235 and 280. The Project Site is also served by Class II bike lanes on Via Rancho Parkway, Bear Valley Parkway, and San Pasqual Road, which would be maintained

Table 22
Existing With Project Conditions (Year 2015)—Street Segment P.M. Peak-Hour Levels of Service

Street Segment	Direction	Existing Conditions		Existing Plus Project Conditions			
		Speed	LOS	Speed	LOS	Change in Speed	Signif. Impact?
Bear Valley Pkwy. between Sunset Dr./Ranchito Dr. & Las Palmas Ave.	NB SB	29.88 40.44	C A	29.26 40.35	C A	(0.62) (0.09)	No No
Bear Valley Pkwy. between Las Palmas Ave. & Canyon Rd.	NB SB	31.15 33.65	B B	31.12 33.59	B B	(0.03) (0.06)	No No
Bear Valley Pkwy. between Canyon Rd. & Entrance Dr./Mary Ln.	NB SB	38.93 36.98	B B	38.86 36.99	B B	(0.07) 0.01	No No
Bear Valley Pkwy. between Entrance Dr./Mary Ln. & San Pasqual Rd.	NB SB	36.70 36.30	B B	36.70 35.99	B B	0.00 (0.31)	No No
Bear Valley Pkwy. between San Pasqual Rd. & Beethoven Dr.	NB SB	32.87 28.82	B C	32.63 28.04	B C	(0.24) (0.78)	No No
Via Rancho Pkwy. between Felicita Rd./Quiet Hills Dr. & Quiet Hills Dr./Camino del Postigo	EB WB	40.63 38.87	A B	40.47 39.41	A B	(0.16) 0.54	No No
Via Rancho Pkwy. between Quiet Hills Dr./Camino del Postigo & Del Lago Boulevard/I-15 SB Ramps	EB WB	25.64 43.36	C A	26.26 43.32	C A	0.62 (0.04)	No No
Via Rancho Pkwy. between Del Lago Boulevard/I-15 SB Ramps & Driveway #6/I-15 NB Ramps	EB WB	18.89 19.75	D D	18.74 19.55	D D	(0.15) (0.20)	No No
Via Rancho Pkwy. between Driveway #6/I-15 NB Ramps & Driveway #7/ Sunset Dr.	EB WB	32.11 18.77	B D	31.72 18.34	B E	(0.39) (0.43)	No No
Via Rancho Pkwy. between Driveway #7/Sunset Dr. & Beethoven Dr.	EB WB	18.94 37.56	D B	18.33 37.54	E B	(0.61) (0.02)	No No

Source: Gibson Transportation Consulting, Inc., 2015.

Table 23
Near Term Cumulative With Project Conditions (Year 2018)—Street Segment P.M. Peak-Hour Levels of Service

Street Segment	Direction	Near Term Cumulative Without Project Conditions		Near Term Cumulative Plus Project Conditions			
		Speed	LOS	Speed	LOS	Change in Speed	Signif. Impact?
Bear Valley Pkwy. between Sunset Dr./Ranchito Dr. & Las Palmas Ave.	NB SB	30.04 40.19	C A	29.45 40.07	C A	(0.59) (0.12)	No No
Bear Valley Pkwy. between Las Palmas Ave. & Canyon Rd.	NB SB	29.75 34.48	C B	29.78 34.46	C B	0.03 (0.02)	No No
Bear Valley Pkwy. between Canyon Rd. & Entrance Dr./Mary Ln.	NB SB	39.49 36.77	A B	39.44 36.78	B B	(0.05) 0.01	No No
Bear Valley Pkwy. between Entrance Dr./Mary Ln. & San Pasqual Rd.	NB SB	36.70 36.30	B B	36.70 36.17	B B	0.00 (0.13)	No No
Bear Valley Pkwy. between San Pasqual Rd. & Beethoven Dr.	NB SB	32.87 28.78	B C	32.62 28.19	B C	(0.25) (0.59)	No No
Via Rancho Pkwy. between Felicita Rd./Quiet Hills Dr. & Quiet Hills Dr./Camino del Postigo	EB WB	40.63 38.87	A B	40.47 37.47	A A	(0.16) (1.40)	No No
Via Rancho Pkwy. between Quiet Hills Dr./Camino del Postigo & Del Lago Boulevard/I-15 SB Ramps	EB WB	25.91 43.40	C A	26.55 43.36	C A	0.64 (0.04)	No No
Via Rancho Pkwy. between Del Lago Boulevard/I-15 SB Ramps & Driveway #6/I-15 NB Ramps	EB WB	18.96 21.05	D D	18.93 20.81	D D	(0.03) (0.24)	No No
Via Rancho Pkwy. between Driveway #6/I-15 NB Ramps & Driveway #7/ Sunset Dr.	EB WB	31.98 18.92	B D	31.60 18.56	B E	(0.38) (0.36)	No No
Via Rancho Pkwy. between Driveway #7/Sunset Dr. & Beethoven Dr.	EB WB	19.36 37.32	D B	18.98 37.27	D B	(0.38) (0.05	No No

Source: Gibson Transportation Consulting, Inc., 2015.

Table 24
Horizon Year With Project Conditions (Year 2035)—Street Segment P.M. Peak-Hour Levels of Service

Street Segment	Direction	Horizon Year Without Project Conditions		Horizon Year Plus Project Conditions			
		Speed	LOS	Speed	LOS	Change in Speed	Signif. Impact?
Bear Valley Pkwy. between Sunset Dr./Ranchito Dr. & Las Palmas Ave.	NB SB	35.60 43.14	B A	35.31 43.15	B A	(0.29) 0.01	No No
Bear Valley Pkwy. between Las Palmas Ave. & Canyon Rd.	NB SB	34.43 29.83	B C	34.41 29.75	B C	(0.02) (0.08)	No No
Bear Valley Pkwy. between Canyon Rd. & Entrance Dr./Mary Ln.	NB SB	37.46 36.90	B B	37.29 37.16	B B	(0.17) 0.26	No No
Bear Valley Pkwy. between Entrance Dr./Mary Ln. & San Pasqual Rd.	NB SB	36.06 36.67	B B	36.04 36.54	B B	(0.02) (0.13)	No No
Bear Valley Pkwy. between San Pasqual Rd. & Beethoven Dr.	NB SB	33.86 30.77	B C	33.92 30.47	B C	0.06 (0.30)	No No
Via Rancho Pkwy. between Felicita Rd./Quiet Hills Dr. & Quiet Hills Dr./Camino del Postigo	EB WB	39.86 40.18	A A	39.88 39.47	A A	0.02 (0.71)	No No
Via Rancho Pkwy. between Quiet Hills Dr./Camino del Postigo & Del Lago Boulevard/I-15 SB Ramps	EB WB	30.99 42.91	C A	30.77 42.81	C A	(0.22) (0.10)	No No
Via Rancho Pkwy. between Del Lago Boulevard/I-15 SB Ramps & Driveway #6/I-15 NB Ramps	EB WB	24.46 20.83	C D	24.78 20.67	C D	0.32 (0.16)	No No
Via Rancho Pkwy. between Driveway #6/I-15 NB Ramps & Driveway #7/ Sunset Dr.	EB WB	32.97 20.77	B D	32.97 20.24	B D	0.00 (0.53)	No No
Via Rancho Pkwy. between Driveway #7/Sunset Dr. & Beethoven Dr.	EB WB	24.73 35.00	C B	24.11 34.90	C B	(0.62) (0.10	No No

Source: Gibson Transportation Consulting, Inc., 2015.

Table 25
Freeway Ramp Meter Analysis—P.M. Peak Hour

Location	Existing Conditions					Existing With Project Conditions						
	Demand (veh/hr)	Meter Rate (veh/hr)	Excess Demand (veh/hr)	Delay (min)	Queue (feet)	Demand (veh/hr)	Meter Rate (veh/hr)	Excess Demand (veh/hr)	Delay (min)	Queue (feet)	Change in Delay (min)	Signif. Impact?
I-15 Northbound On-Ramp @ Via Rancho Parkway	577	425	152	21.46	4,408	589	425	164	23.15	4,756	1.69	No

Location	Near Term Cumulative Without Project Conditions					Near Term Cumulative With Project Conditions						
	Demand (veh/hr)	Meter Rate (veh/hr)	Excess Demand (veh/hr)	Delay (min)	Queue (feet)	Demand (veh/hr)	Meter Rate (veh/hr)	Excess Demand (veh/hr)	Delay (min)	Queue (feet)	Change in Delay (min)	Signif. Impact?
I-15 Northbound On-Ramp @ Via Rancho Parkway	577	425	152	21.46	4,408	589	425	164	23.15	4,756	1.69	No

Location	Horizon Year Without Project Conditions					Horizon Year With Project Conditions						
	Demand (veh/hr)	Meter Rate (veh/hr)	Excess Demand (veh/hr)	Delay (min)	Queue (feet)	Demand (veh/hr)	Meter Rate (veh/hr)	Excess Demand (veh/hr)	Delay (min)	Queue (feet)	Change in Delay (min)	Signif. Impact?
I-15 Northbound On-Ramp @ Via Rancho Parkway	617	425	192	27.11	5,568	629	425	204	28.80	5,916	1.69	No

Source: Gibson Transportation Consulting, Inc., 2015.

with implementation of the Project. The Project would not remove or obstruct existing transit or bike routes. Furthermore, the Project is not anticipated to generate a significant increase in transit or bike trips. Therefore, impacts related to transit and bicycle facilities would be less than significant.

Parking

The existing Project Site currently has approximately 5,684 parking spaces within contiguous surface parking areas. The Project proposes the removal of 202 spaces within the Development Area to construct a theater building and an outdoor pedestrian plaza. The Applicant is required to provide four parking spaces per 1,000 square feet of GLA per City Code. Implementation of the Project would result in a total of 1,329,826 square feet of GLA at the Westfield North County Regional Shopping Center; thus, a minimum of 5,320 parking spaces would be required. Upon Project buildout, the Project Site would have 5,482 parking spaces remaining, providing a surplus of 162 spaces over City's requirement. Accordingly, parking impacts would be less than significant.

Construction Traffic

Construction of the Project is anticipated to last 15 months and be completed in 2017. The anticipated construction phases include site clearing, grading and excavation, and construction of the foundation, new building, pedestrian plaza, and landscape areas.

Construction Workers

Construction worker traffic impacts depend on the number of construction workers employed during various construction phases, as well as the travel mode and travel time of the workers. Typical construction hours require workers to be on-site before the weekday morning commuter peak period (i.e., prior to 7:00 A.M.) and allow them to leave before or after the afternoon commuter peak period (i.e., before 4:00 P.M. or after 6:00 P.M.). Therefore, most, if not all, of construction worker trips would occur outside of the typical weekday commuter or weekend midday peak periods.

The estimated number of construction workers each day would vary based on the construction phase (e.g., demolition, grading, building construction, etc.) and is anticipated to range between approximately 50 and 60 workers. Assuming some level of carpooling among the construction workers, an Average Vehicle Ridership of 1.135 persons per vehicle was applied, as provided in the SCAQMD's *CEQA Air Quality Handbook*.[48] Accordingly, during the

[48] *South Coast Air Quality Management District*, *CEQA Air Quality Handbook, 1993.*

construction phase with the largest number of workers (i.e., building construction), when 60 workers would be present on-site, an estimated 106 daily trips (53 inbound and 53 outbound trips) would be generated, all of which would occur outside of the peak hours. Analysis of these trips combined with construction-related truck traffic, discussed below, is provided later in this section.

During construction, adequate parking for construction workers would be provided within the boundaries of the Project Site. Restrictions against workers parking in the public right-of-way in the surrounding vicinity would be identified as part of a Construction Management Plan, detailed below. Construction activities also may require use of on-site parking areas for materials storage and truck staging. However, construction schedules, storage and staging, and the provisions for parking spaces for construction workers would be planned so as to minimize any reduction in parking for Westfield North County Shopping Center employees and patrons. Therefore, Project construction would result in a less than significant impact with regard to the availability of parking spaces.

Haul Trucks

Demolition and earthwork activities are estimated to result in the export of approximately 300 cy of material, which would be hauled to one or more landfills located in the cities surrounding the Project Site. However, the traffic analysis conservatively assumed that 2,666 cy of material would be exported. Accordingly, based on the use of 12 to 14 cy haul trucks and assuming all demolition and grading would occur during a two-week period, the Project would involve the export of approximately 267 cy of materials per day, for a total of 46 daily haul trips (23 inbound and 23 outbound), or approximately 10 trips per hour (five inbound, five outbound) assuming a uniform distribution over a 5-hour period.

As part of the City's permitting process, the Project would require a Haul Truck Route program. The haul route would comply with approved truck routes designated within the City and County of San Diego. The anticipated haul route would follow Beethoven Drive to Via Rancho Parkway to the I-15 Freeway.

Delivery Trucks

With respect to the delivery of construction materials, an average of between 10 and 30 daily delivery truck trips to/from the Project Site is estimated, depending on the construction phase. The largest number of deliveries is anticipated during the building construction phase, with approximately 30 daily delivery trips (15 inbound and 15 outbound), or approximately six trips per hour (three inbound and three outbound), assuming a uniform distribution over a five-hour period.

Construction Traffic Impacts

To assess the impact of truck trips on the local roadway system, a passenger car equivalent (PCE) factor of 2.0 was applied.[49] Accordingly, the 46 daily haul trips and 30 daily delivery trips would be equivalent to 152 passenger car trips per day. Such trips would occur in addition to the estimated 106 daily construction worker trips. As the majority of construction traffic would occur during off-peak hours, Project construction is not expected to cause a significant traffic impact at any of the study intersections. In order to minimize the effect of construction-related traffic on the surrounding street system, all construction workers, haul trucks, and delivery trucks would be prohibited from parking, staging, or queuing along the adjacent public streets. With implementation of the Construction Management Plan detailed below, construction traffic impacts on study intersections would be less than significant.

As previously indicated, construction activities are expected to be largely contained within the Project Site and thus generally would not affect access, transit, or parking on adjacent streets or in the surrounding area. In particular, the adjacent bus stop and route along Beethoven Drive would be maintained during construction. As such, no temporary loss of bus stops or rerouting of bus lines is anticipated. Project construction also is not expected to create hazards for roadway travelers, bus riders, or parkers in light of the Construction Management Plan to be implemented. Therefore, construction traffic impacts with respect to access, transit, and parking would be less than significant.

Construction Management Plan

A detailed Construction Management Plan, including street closure information, detour plans, haul routes, and staging plans, would be prepared and submitted to the City for review and approval. The Construction Management Plan would formalize how construction would be carried out and identify specific actions to be implemented to reduce impacts on the surrounding community. The Construction Management Plan would be based on the nature and timing of the Project's specific construction activities and other projects in the vicinity of the Project Site and would include the following elements, as appropriate:

- Prohibition of construction worker parking and construction-related vehicle parking on public streets;

[49] *Transportation Research Circular No. 212, Interim Materials on Highway Capacity (Transportation Research Board, 1980) defines PCE for a vehicle as the number of through moving passenger cars to which it is equivalent based on the vehicle's headway and delay-creating effects. Table 8 of the Transportation Research Circular No. 212 and Exhibit 11.10 of the 2010 HCM suggest a PCE of 2.0 for trucks.*

- Prohibition of construction equipment or material deliveries within the public right-of-way;
- Provisions for temporary traffic control during all construction activities adjacent to a public right-of-way to improve traffic flow on public roadways (e.g., flag person);
- Scheduling of construction activities to reduce the effect on traffic flow on surrounding arterial streets;
- Safety precautions for pedestrians and bicyclists, such as alternate routing and protection barriers, as appropriate;
- Provisions to accommodate equipment storage and truck staging on-site;
- Scheduling of construction-related deliveries, haul trips, etc., so as to occur outside the commuter peak hours to the extent feasible; and
- Obtaining the required permits for truck haul routes from the City prior to issuance of any permit for the Project.

Conclusion

Based on the above, the Project would not result in significant impacts associated with any conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system. Project traffic would not exceed City thresholds for intersections or street segments. Thus, impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required. However, Project Applicant has agreed to make a voluntary fair-share payment to help the City achieve acceptable LOS at the segments of Bear Valley Parkway between Sunset Drive/Ranchito Drive and Las Palmas Avenue and between San Pasqual Road and Beethoven Drive, which currently operate at LOS F and are predicted to continue operating at LOS F in the future. The fair-share payment would be based on the percentage of growth attributable to Project traffic, which has been determined to be 15.2 percent for the segment of Bear Valley Parkway between Sunset Drive/Ranchito Drive and Las Palmas Avenue, and 29.8 percent for the segment of Bear Valley Parkway between San Pasqual Road and Beethoven Drive.

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
b. Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to, level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Less Than Significant Impact. The Congestion Management Program (CMP) is a state-mandated program enacted by the legislature to address the impacts of urban congestion on local communities and the region as a whole. As described above in Response to Checklist Question 16.a, no significant traffic impacts would occur due to the Project. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures would be required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	☐	☐	☐	☒

No Impact. The Project Site is not located within the vicinity of any private or public airport or planning boundary of any airport land use plan. The nearest public airport is the Ramona Airport, located approximately nine miles southeast of the Project Site in the County of San Diego. Additionally, the Project does not propose any uses that would increase the frequency of air traffic. Thus, no impacts to air traffic patterns would occur, and no mitigation measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Less Than Significant Impact. The roadways adjacent to the Project Site are part of the urban roadway network and do not contain sharp curves or dangerous intersections. In addition, as shown in the Conceptual Site Plan provided in Figure A-4 of Attachment A, Project Description, no sharp curves or dangerous intersections would be introduced by the Project. Furthermore, access to the Project Site would be designed and constructed in accordance with regulatory requirements. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures would be required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
e. Result in inadequate emergency access?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Less than Significant Impact. According to the City's General Plan, Bear Valley Parkway adjacent to the Project Site is designated as an evacuation route. However, the main portion of the Development Area is located adjacent to Beethoven Drive, approximately 1,500 feet north of Bear Valley Parkway. Further, the Project does not include improvements along Bear Valley Parkway that would alter the existing lane configurations of these streets, nor would the Project require the installation of any barriers that would impede emergency response. Therefore, the Project would not cause an impediment along the City's designated evacuation routes or impair implementation of the City's emergency response plan. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
f. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Less Than Significant Impact. As discussed in Response to Checklist Question No. 16.a, transit service in the Project vicinity is provided by NCTD and MTS. Specifically, the Project Site is served by NCTD Route 350 and MTS Routes 235 and 280. Existing transit service is anticipated to adequately accommodate any Project-generated transit trips. The Project Site is also served by Class II bike lanes on Via Rancho Parkway, Bear Valley Parkway, and San Pasqual Road, which would be maintained under the Project. Construction and operation of the Project would not permanently alter any bicycle or pedestrian facilities within the Project vicinity. As such, the Project would not conflict with adopted policies,

programs, or plans supporting alternative transportation. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

18. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a Tribal Cultural Resource as defined in §21074?	☐	☐	☒	☐

No Impact: On September 25, 2014, Governor Brown signed Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52), which requires a lead agency to provide notice to tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of a proposed project. The lead agency must provide written, formal notification to the tribes that have requested it within 14 days of a decision to undertake a project or deeming a project application complete. The tribe must respond to the lead agency within 30 days of receipt of the notification if it wishes to engage in consultation on the project, and the lead agency must being the consultation process within 30 days of receiving the request for consultation. Consultation concludes when the parties agree to mitigation measures to avoid a significant effect, if one exists, on a tribal cultural resource, or when a party, acting in good faith and after reasonable effort, concludes that mutual agreement cannot be reached.

In response to the City of Escondido's notification of the Project, the City received letters from the Rincon Band of Luiseno Indians and the Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians declining consultation on the Project. The San Luis Rey Band of Mission Indians requested consultation with the City, which occurred on August 28, 2015. The results of the consultation with the San Luis Rey Band of Mission Indians indicated that no potential impacts to tribal cultural resources would occur as a result of the Project. Therefore, the consultation was closed and no mitigation measures are required.

19. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:

The following discussion is based in part on the Utility Technical Report provided as Appendix F, which contains a memo from Samuel Jacoby of R.A. Smith National to Larry Slonim of Architects Orange, dated July 20, 2015 and a memo from Debi Wilhelm of SDGE to Larry Slonim of Architects Orange, dated July 30, 2015; and the energy worksheets provided in Appendix G of this Initial Study.

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Less Than Significant Impact. According to the City's 2010 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP), the Project Site is located within the Escondido Sewer Service Area boundary.[50] Wastewater from the Project Site is treated at the Hale Avenue Resource Recovery Facility (HARRF). The HARRF has a treatment capacity of 18 million gallons per day (mgd), with a land outfall maximum flow of 20.1 mgd. The HARRF is an activated sludge, secondary treatment facility and consists of physical, biological, and chemical treatment methods, which include screening, sedimentation, chemical precipitation, and biological processes. The HARRF serves Escondido and the Rancho Bernardo area in the City of San Diego. The HARRF operates 24 hours a day with an average daily flow of 15.6 mgd (an average of 11.8 mgd from the City and 3.8 mgd from Rancho Bernardo).

After complex treatment, all wastewater that is not recycled is discharged from the HARRF to the Pacific Ocean via a 14-mile land outfall pipeline that connects to an ocean outfall pipeline near San Elijo Lagoon. The Escondido Water and Wastewater Division (EWWD) sends any remaining biosolids to Yuma, Arizona for beneficial reuse as soil amendment. The HARRF treatment and disposal capacity has reached 75 percent of its rated total capacity; the Strategic Business Plan prepared by the City Utilities Department anticipated that flows to the HARRF would reach 18 mgd in 2014. However, flows have slowed somewhat due to drought conditions, slowed economic growth, and slowed housing development over the past several years.[51]

---

[50] *City of Escondido Urban Water Management Plan, July 2011, www.escondido.org/Data/Sites/1/media/pdfs/Utilities/2010UrbanWaterManagementPlan.pdf, accessed July 31, 2015.*

[51] *Hale Avenue Resource Recovery Facility (HARRF), www.escondido.org/harrf.aspx, accessed July 31, 2015.*

Based on the amount of wastewater expected to be generated by the Project, adequate wastewater treatment capacity would be available to serve the Project (see Response to Checklist Question No. 17.e for further discussion). Additionally, the Project is not anticipated to generate flows containing constituents that would jeopardize the ability of the HARRF to operate within its established wastewater treatment requirements. Further, Project wastewater would be treated according to the treatment requirements enforced by the NPDES permit authorized by the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board (SDRWQCB). Therefore, the Project would not exceed the wastewater treatment requirements of the SDRWQCB, and impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation measures would be required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
b. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Less Than Significant Impact. The City of Escondido Water Division provides water service for domestic and fire protection uses. While domestic water demand is typically the main contributor to water consumption, fire flow demands have a much greater instantaneous impact on infrastructure and therefore are the primary means for analyzing infrastructure capacity. As set forth in the Utility Technical Report, the Project area is served by a 12-inch water line to the east and a 16-inch and 12-inch line to the northwest. Although the Development Area is currently comprised of a surface parking area, it previously contained four separate buildings, including a restaurant. Based on this historical use, which had relatively high water usage, it is anticipated that the existing water lines have adequate capacity to supply the proposed theater for both domestic and fire water demand. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
c. Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Less Than Significant Impact. As discussed in Response to Checklist Question 9.c, existing on-site drainage patterns would be preserved under the Project. Stormwater would be

directed to the existing storm drains located within Beethoven Drive and along the northwest portion of the Development Area. Aside from storm drain inlets, as needed, the Project would not require the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Less Than Significant Impact. The Escondido Water Division currently provides water to the Project Site. Escondido Water Division receives its primary water supply from the San Diego County Water Authority (SDCWA) aqueducts, which deliver imported water from northern California and the Colorado River, via the Metropolitan Water District (MWD), to San Diego County. Local water also supplies the City from precipitation in the San Luis Rey River Watershed and is stored in Lake Henshaw and Lake Wohlford. Locally, the HARRF provides recycled water.

Escondido Water Division supplies potable water to approximately 26,000 residential, commercial, industrial, and agricultural meters serving 146,000 customers and operates and maintains approximately 440 miles of pipe, 11 water reservoirs, five pump stations, two dams and associated lakes, and the Escondido–Vista Water Treatment Plant (WTP) and clearwell. All of the water supplied to the City's service area is treated at the Escondido-Vista Water Treatment Plant (WTP) and distributed to customers within the service area, as well as to the Vista Irrigation District and the parts of the Rincon MWD.[52]

The California Urban Water Management Planning Act requires that each urban water supplier providing water for municipal purposes to more than 3,000 customers, or supplying more than 3,000 acre-feet (AF) of water annually, prepare, update and adopt an Urban Water Management Plan at least once every five years. The City's 2010 UWMP, adopted in July

[52] *Escondido 2012 Water Master Plan, www.escondido.org/Data/Sites/1/media/PDFs/Utilities/WaterMasterPlan.pdf, June 2012, accessed July 31, 2015.*

2011, anticipates adequate water supplies for the service area under normal, single-dry, and multi-dry year conditions through the year 2030.[53]

As previously discussed, the Project Site previously contained four stand-alone buildings, including a restaurant. According to the Utility Technical Report, it is anticipated that sufficient water supplies would be available to serve the Project, and no new or expanded water entitlements would be needed. It is anticipated that the Project would require a demand of approximately 100 gallons per minute.[54] Further, to ensure adequate supply and service, the Project would comply with all applicable design criteria of the City of Escondido 2012 Water Master Plan. Based on the above, it is anticipated that sufficient water supplies would be available to serve the Project, and no new or expanded water entitlements would be needed. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
e. 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?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Less Than Significant Impact. Refer to Response to Checklist Question No. 17.a, above. As discussed therein, wastewater from the Project would be treated at the HARRF.

The Escondido Wastewater Master Plan Update documents the existing wastewater system facilities and flows and identifies required improvements for build-out within the City's service area, which is anticipated to occur by 2035. The wastewater system analyses conducted and documented in this report identify existing deficiencies in the system, confirm facility sizing, and recommend a future capital improvement program (CIP) based on updated wastewater flow generation analyses and hydraulic modeling. This Master Plan provides an

[53] *City of Escondido Urban Water Management Plan, July 2011, www.escondido.org/Data/Sites/1/media/pdfs/Utilities/2010UrbanWaterManagementPlan.pdf, accessed July 31, 2015.*

[54] *Email correspondence with Sam Jacoby, P.E., R.A. Smith National; August 13, 2015*

update to the 2005 Wastewater Master Plan Update for continued reliable wastewater service through buildout in accordance with the City's most recent amendments to the General Plan.[55]

The HARRF is currently undergoing the strategic plan for a feasible five–year financing plan for operations and capital improvements projects, and the related budgets will provide direction in meeting the challenges of the Wastewater/Stormwater Fund and accomplishing the establishment and maintenance of adequate reserves. It will also allow a rate stabilization reserve to be funded and maintained and provide for funding for emergencies that arise. Ongoing planning is underway for meeting the City's anticipated buildout capacity scheduled for 2041, consistent with the General Plan.[56]

As described above, it is anticipated the Project would require a demand of approximately 100 gallons per minute of water. Accordingly, as a conservative estimate, it is anticipated the Project would generate approximately of 100 gallons per minute of wastewater.[57] Based on the amount of wastewater expected to be generated by the Project, and future wastewater treatment capacity, adequate wastewater treatment capacity would be available to serve the Project Site together with projected future demand and existing commitments. As such, the Project would have a less than significant impact with respect to wastewater treatment and infrastructure. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Less Than Significant Impact. Escondido Disposal (EDCO) would provide the Project with solid waste services. Solid waste would be taken to one of several transfer stations in the area and then disposed of at the Sycamore Landfill in Santee, California. According to the County of San Diego Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan, this landfill has

[55] *City of Escondido Wastewater Management Plan, June 2012, www.escondido.org/Data/Sites/1/media/PDFs/Utilities/WastewaterMasterPlan.pdf, accessed July 31, 2015.*

[56] *City of Escondido Utilities Department Strategic Business Plan, www.escondido.org/data/sites/1/media/pdfs/utilities/strategicbusinessplan.pdf, accessed July 31, 2015.*

[57] *Email correspondence with Sam Jacoby, P.E., R.A. Smith National; August 13, 2015*

sufficient capacity to accommodate the Project's solid waste.[58] Therefore, impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Less Than Significant Impact. Solid waste management in the State is primarily guided by the California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 (AB 939) which emphasizes resource conservation through reduction, recycling, and reuse of solid waste. AB 939 establishes an integrated waste management hierarchy consisting of (in order of priority): (1) source reduction; (2) recycling and composting; and (3) environmentally safe transformation and land disposal.

The Project would be consistent with the applicable regulations associated with solid waste and would promote compliance with AB 939 by providing clearly marked, source-sorted receptacles to facilitate recycling. The Applicant would also enhance recycling on-site through a recycling program that would focus on items such as paper, cardboard, glass, aluminum, plastic, and cooking oils. Since the Project would comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste, no significant impacts would occur, and no mitigation measures would be required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
h. Other utilities and service systems?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Less Than Significant Impact. In accordance with Appendix F of the CEQA Guidelines, this discussion includes relevant information and analyses that address the energy implications of the Project. This section represents a summary of the Project's anticipated energy needs, impacts and conservation measures.

[58] *County of San Diego Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan, San Diego County Five-Year Review Report, p. 16, September 2012.*

Construction

During Project construction, energy would be consumed in three general forms: (1) petroleum-based fuels used to power off-road construction vehicles and equipment on the Project Site, construction worker travel to and from the Project Site, as well as delivery and haul truck trips (e.g., hauling of demolition material to off-site reuse and disposal facilities); (2) electricity associated with the conveyance of water that would be used during Project construction for dust control (supply and conveyance) and electricity associated with providing temporary power for lighting and electronic equipment; and (3) energy used in the production of construction materials, such as asphalt, steel, concrete, pipes, and manufactured or processed materials such as lumber and glass. As shown in Table 26 on page 107, a total of 617 kWh of electricity, 3,804 gallons of gasoline, and 19,312 gallons of diesel fuel would be consumed during Project construction.

As described above, electricity would be consumed during the conveyance of the water used during construction activities that require the use of water to control fugitive dust. Furthermore, electricity used to provide temporary power for lighting and electronic equipment for general construction activity would be minimal and not result in a net increase in on-site electricity use over existing conditions. These electrical uses would be supplied to the Project Site by San Diego Gas & Electric (SDG&E) and would be obtained from the existing electrical lines that connect to the Project Site. Similar to the use of petroleum-based fuels, electricity consumed during Project construction would be temporary and would cease upon the completion of construction, as well as vary depending on site-specific operations and the amount of construction occurring at any given time. Overall, construction activities associated with the Project would require limited electricity generation that would not be expected to have an adverse impact on available electricity supplies.

Construction of the Project's electrical infrastructure would occur entirely within the Project Site, other than the possible need for off-site connections to facilities adjacent to the Project Site. As such, construction of the Project's electrical infrastructure is not anticipated to adversely affect the electrical infrastructure serving the surrounding uses, utility system capacity, or existing electrical infrastructure. The Project's on-site electrical system would consist of underground electrical lines, conduits, banks, and transformers, as needed. Where feasible, the new service installations and connections would be scheduled and implemented in a manner that would not result in electrical service interruptions to other properties. Compliance with SDG&E's guidelines and requirements would ensure the Applicant fulfills its responsibilities relative to infrastructure installation, coordinates any electrical infrastructure removals or relocations with SDG&E and limits any impacts associated with grading, construction, and development within SDG&E easements, if applicable.

Table 26
Summary of Energy Use During Construction[a]

Fuel Type	Quantity
Electricity	
Water Consumption	617 kWh
Total	**617 kWh**
Gasoline	
On-Road Construction Equipment	3,804 Gallons
Off- Road Construction Equipment	0 Gallons
Total	**3,804 Gallons**
Diesel	
On- Road Construction Equipment	15,495 Gallons
Off- Road Construction Equipment	3,817 Gallons
Total	**19,312 Gallons**

[a] *Detailed calculations are provided in Appendix G of this Initial Study.*

Source: Eyestone Environmental, 2015.

The petroleum-based fuel use summary provided in Table 26 represents the highest amount of energy that would be consumed during Project construction. While construction activities would consume petroleum-based fuels, consumption of such resources would be temporary and would cease upon the completion of construction. The Project's consumption of petroleum-based fuels would not have an adverse impact on available supplies.

Therefore, the Project's on-site construction activities would not result in the inefficient use of energy resources, create energy utility system capacity problems, create problems with the provision of energy services, or result in a significant impact associated with the construction of new or expanded energy facilities. As such, impacts would be less than significant.

Operation

During operation of the Project, energy would be consumed for multiple purposes including, but not limited to heating/ventilating/air conditioning (HVAC), refrigeration, lighting, electronics, and office equipment. Energy would also be consumed during Project operations related to water usage, solid waste disposal, and vehicle trips. Annual energy use has been calculated for buildout of the Project and is shown in Table 27 on page 108. The Project is expected to consume 599,983 kWh of electricity, 5,000 therms of natural gas, 161,220 gallons of gasoline, and 21,829 gallons of diesel fuel per year.

Table 27
Annual Energy Use

Source	Project		Percent Reduction with Incorporation of Project Features
	Without Regulatory Compliance Measures	With Regulatory Compliance Measures	
Electricity (kWh)			
Building (kWh)	453,150	430,795	-5%
Water (kWh)	211,485	169,188	-20%
Total Electricity (kWh)	664,635	599,983	-10%
Natural Gas (therms)	5,654	5,000	-12%
Mobile			
Gasoline (Gallons)	214,976	161,220	-25%
Diesel (Gallons)	29,108	21,829	-25%

[a] *Detailed calculations are provided in Appendix G of this Initial Study.*

Source: Eyestone Environmental, 2015.

Electricity transmission to the Project Site is provided and maintained by SDG&E through a network of utility poles and underground utility lines. As shown in Table 27, with buildout of the Project, the on-site electricity demand would be approximately 599,983 kilowatt-hours (kWh) of electricity per year. SDG&E has confirmed that the Project's electricity demand can be served by the facilities in the Project area.[59] With regard to supply, the California Energy Commission (CEC) analyzes energy usage throughout the State and publishes a demand forecast staff report every few years, the most recent of which covers the 2014–2024 period. CEC estimates future electricity consumption within SDG&E's planning area will be 23,337 GWh.[60] Therefore, the Project's electricity demand would represent approximately 0.003 percent of the demand forecasted in the SDG&E's planning area. As such, SDG&E would have adequate supplies to serve the Project's electricity demand. Thus, impacts with

[59] *San Diego Gas and Electric Westfield North County—Beethoven Drive, Escondido, CA, July 30, 2015. Refer to Appendix F of this Initial Study.*

[60] *The California Energy Commission's forecast includes three scenarios: a high energy demand case, a low energy demand case, and a mid energy demand case. The consumption forecast for the low energy demand case is used in this calculation to provide a conservative analysis of the Project (i.e., the Project would represent a greater percentage of overall demand under this scenario). California Energy Commission, Commission Final Report, California Energy Demand 2014–2024 Final Forecast, January 2014, p. A-3, www.energy.ca.gov/2013publications/CEC-200-2013-004/CEC-200-2013-004-V1-CMF.pdf, accessed July 9, 2015.*

regard to electrical supply and infrastructure capacity would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures would be required.

Natural gas service is provided to the Project Site by the SDG&E. As shown in Table 27 on page 108, with buildout of the Project, the Project is estimated to consume approximately 5,000 therms of natural gas. SDG&E has confirmed that the Project's natural gas demand can be served by the facilities in the Project area.[61] The CEC's staff demand forecast for the 2014–2024 period estimates that natural gas consumption within SDG&E's planning area will increase to 511.2 million therms.[62,63] Therefore, the Project's natural gas demand would represent approximately 0.0001 percent of the demand forecasted in the SDG&E's planning area. Impacts with regard to natural gas supply and infrastructure capacity would be less than significant and no mitigation measures would be required.

While operation of the Project would increase energy usage on the Project Site, this increase would be reduced through the implementation of a variety of measures designed to reduce energy consumption. The Project would incorporate features to support and promote environmental sustainability. "Green" principles are included as part of the Project to comply with policies contained in the City of Escondido's General Plan that promote sustainability. Specifically, the Project would utilize light-emitting diode (LED) and energy-efficient lighting, high-efficiency HVAC units, low–volatile organic compound (VOC) paints and finishes, recyclable floor materials, and water-efficient toilets in the design of the proposed theater. In addition, the Project would incorporate a variety of water conservation features that would promote energy conservation.

The Project would consume approximately 161,220 gallons of gasoline and 21,829 gallons of diesel fuel per year, or a total of 183,049 gallons of petroleum-based fuels per year. The Project would result in the consumption of fuel related to vehicular travel to and from the Project Site. However, the Project includes features that would reduce VMT, including internal capture and proximity to public transit opportunities. As shown in Table 27,

---

[61] *San Diego Gas and Electric Westfield North County—Beethoven Drive, Escondido, CA, July 30, 2015. Refer to Appendix F of this Initial Study,*

[62] *Interpolated between 2015 and 2020.*

[63] *The California Energy Commission's forecast includes three scenarios: a high-energy demand case, a low-energy demand case, and a mid-energy demand case. The consumption forecast for the low energy demand case is used in this calculation to provide a conservative analysis of the Project (i.e., the Project would represent a greater percentage of overall demand under this scenario). California Energy Commission, Commission Final Report, California Energy Demand 2014–2024 Final Forecast, January 2014, p. 69, www.energy.ca.gov/2013publications/CEC-200-2013-004/CEC-200-2013-004-V1-CMF.pdf, accessed July 9, 2015.*

these measures would reduce gasoline and diesel usage to by approximately 25 percent per year.

Overall, the Project would be designed and constructed in accordance with state and local green building standards that would serve to reduce the energy demand of the Project. Based on the above, the Project's energy demand would be within the existing and planned electricity and natural gas capacities of SDG&E. Therefore, development of the Project would not cause wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary consumption of energy and would be consistent with the intent of Appendix F of the CEQA Guidelines. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

20. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Less Than Significant Impact. As indicated by the analyses above, the Project would not substantially reduce the habitat of fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, or reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal. In addition, the Project would not eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. Therefore, the Project would not result in environmental impacts that have the potential to degrade the quality of environment. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Less Than Significant Impact. The potential for cumulative impacts occurs when the independent impacts of the Project are combined with the impacts of related projects in proximity to the Project Site, thereby resulting in impacts that are greater than the impacts of

the Project alone. Located within the vicinity of the Project Site are other past, current and/or reasonably foreseeable projects, whose development, in conjunction with that of the Project, may contribute to potential cumulative impacts. A list of the Related Projects proposed in the Greater Project vicinity are is provided in Table 28 on page 113. However, as provided below, the Project would not result in significant cumulatively considerable impacts.

- **Aesthetics**—Project impacts to aesthetics resources have the potential to be cumulatively considerable if Project development in conjunction with related Project development were to substantially alter existing views and the visual character of nearby aesthetic resources. As analyzed above, views of visual resources would not be significantly impacted by the Project. In addition, new buildings constructed as part of the Project would be compatible with the existing shopping center. Related projects would be reviewed on a case-by-case basis by the City to comply with regulatory requirements regarding building heights, setbacks, massing and lighting or, for those projects that require discretionary actions, to undergo site-specific review regarding building density, design, and light and glare effects. Thus, cumulative impacts associated with aesthetics would be less than significant.

- **Air Quality**—The SDAPCD recommends that project-specific air quality impacts be used to determine the potential cumulative impacts to regional air quality. As discussed above, peak daily emissions of construction and operation-related pollutants would not exceed SDAPCD regional or localized significance. Therefore, the cumulative emissions generated by the Project in conjunction with related projects in the area would be less than significant.

- **Agricultural and Forest Resources**—The Project Site and vicinity are not designated as Farmland, zoned for agricultural uses, or used for agricultural uses. In addition, the Project Site is not zoned for forest land and does not include any forest or timberland. Therefore, no cumulative impacts related to agricultural or forest resources would occur.

- **Biological Resources**—As discussed above, the Project would not result in impacts associated with biological resources. The Project Site is highly urbanized. As such, no biological resources, including special status species, wetlands, or habitats supporting such resources are located within the Project Site. Therefore it is not anticipated that the Project, in conjunction with related projects, would result in significant impacts to biological resources. In addition, the impact of related projects on biological resources would be assessed on a project-by-project basis and are generally site-specific. Related projects would also be required to comply with both the City of Escondido regulatory requirements and the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. Thus, cumulative impacts related to biological resources would be less than significant.

Table 28
Related Projects

Project[a]	Address	Description	Size
1. 661 Bear Valley	SE Corner of Bear Valley Pkwy. & Encino Dr.	Residential	55 du
2. Emmanuel Faith Community Church	639 E. 17th Ave.	Church Preschool	400 seats 200 students

du = dwelling units

[a] *Related projects list provided by City of Escondido, May 2015.*

Source: Eyestone Environmental, 2015.

- **Cultural Resources**—As discussed above, the Project would not result in any significant impacts to historic resources. Thus, the Project would not contribute to any cumulative impacts associated with historic resources. The Project is located within an urbanized area that has been highly disturbed by development and the potential to encounter buried archaeological resources in the area is anticipated to be low. However, in the event that such resources are uncovered, each related project would be required to comply with regulatory requirements. In addition, as part of the environmental review processes for the related projects, it is expected that mitigation measures would be established as necessary to address the potential for uncovering of archaeological resources. Therefore, cumulative impacts to cultural resources would be less than significant.

- **Geology and Soils**—Due to their site-specific nature, geology impacts are typically assessed on a project-by-project basis or for a particular localized area. Cumulative development would expose a greater number of people to seismic hazards. However, as with the Project, related projects would be subject to local, state, and federal regulations and standards for seismic safety. Thus, cumulative impacts related to geology and soils would be less than significant.

- **Hazards and Hazardous Materials**—As with the Project, all related development located within the vicinity of the Project Site would be subject to the same local, regional, state, and federal regulations pertaining to hazards and hazardous materials. Therefore, with adherence to such regulations, development of the Project and related projects would not result in cumulatively significant impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials.

- **Hydrology and Water Quality**—Related projects could potentially result in an increase in surface water runoff and contribute point and non-point source pollutants to nearby water bodies. However, as with the Project, related projects would be subject to NPDES permit requirements for both construction and operation, including development of SWPPPs for construction projects greater than one acre,

compliance with SUSMP requirements during operation, and compliance with other local requirements pertaining to hydrology and surface water quality. It is anticipated that related projects would be evaluated on an individual basis by City of Escondido Department of Public Works to determine appropriate BMPs and treatment measures to avoid significant impacts to hydrology and surface water quality. Thus, cumulative impacts related to hydrology/water quality would be less than significant.

- **Greenhouse Gas Emissions**—As evaluated above, the Project would not result in significant greenhouse gas emissions. Further, the analysis of greenhouse gas emissions is cumulative in nature. Thus, the Project would not result in significant cumulatively considerable impacts associated with greenhouse gas emissions.

- **Land Use**—As with the Project, related projects would be reviewed on a case-by-case basis to ensure consistency with existing land use policies and regulations. Where inconsistencies occur, it is anticipated that appropriate actions would be undertaken to ensure that land use impacts would be less than significant. Furthermore, no related projects that could cause land use incompatibility are known to be located in the immediate vicinity of the Project Site. Thus, cumulative land use impacts would be less than significant.

- **Noise**—With compliance with regulatory requirements, noise impacts from construction and operation of the Project would be less than significant. Like the Project, related projects would also be required to comply with City of Escondido requirements related to construction and operational noise. Thus, cumulative noise impacts would be less than significant.

- **Mineral Resources**—As the Project Site is not located within a mineral producing area as classified by the CGS, the Project would not result in the loss of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site. Furthermore, no mineral resources or extraction operations for such resources occur in the Project vicinity. Therefore, cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

- **Paleontological Resources**—As discussed above, the Project located within an urbanized area and have been subject to ground disturbance in the past. Thus, the potential to encounter buried archaeological resources in the area is anticipated to be low. However, in the event that such resources are uncovered, each related project would be required to comply with regulatory requirements. In addition, as part of the environmental review processes for the related projects, it is expected that mitigation measures would be established as necessary to address the potential for uncovering of paleontological resources. Therefore, cumulative impacts to paleontological resources would be less than significant.

- **Population and Housing**—As discussed above, the Project does not include new housing, and the creation of new jobs is not expected to cause a notable number of people to move to the Project vicinity. In addition, while related projects could cumulatively increase population in the area, such increases are generally expected

to be within City and SANDAG growth forecasts. Thus, cumulative impacts associated with population and housing would be less than significant.

- **Fire Protection**—Development of the Project in conjunction with related projects would cumulatively increase the demand for fire services. However, all projects would be required to comply with response distance criteria, applicable fire safety regulations, and standard conditions imposed by the EFD. In addition, all project plans would be reviewed by the EFD in order to ensure adequate fire flow capabilities and adequate emergency access. Thus, cumulative impacts associated with fire protection would be less than significant.

- **Police Protection**—Development of the Project in conjunction with related projects would cumulatively increase the demand for EPD services. However, it is anticipated that related projects would be reviewed by the EPD to ensure that sufficient security measures would be implemented to reduce potential impacts to police protection services. Thus, cumulative impacts associated with police protection would be less than significant.

- **Schools**—The Project would not contribute to the need for educational facilities. In addition, related projects would be required to pay school fees to the EUSD. In accordance with Section 65995 of the California Government Code, payment of such fees is deemed to provide full and complete mitigation of school facilities impacts. Thus, cumulative impacts associated with public educational services would be less than significant.

- **Parks and Recreation**—The Project does not include residential development, which typically creates demand on park services. In addition, related projects would be subject to discretionary review by the City and would be required to implement mitigation measures, incorporate open space areas as required by the City of Escondido, and/or pay park fees as required by the Quimby Act. Therefore, cumulative impacts associated with parks and recreation would be less than significant.

- **Libraries**—As discussed above, the Project would not result in a significant impact on library services and facilities. In addition, much of the growth associated with the related projects is already accounted for in the service population projections made by the SANDAG. Furthermore, it would be expected that related projects would implement measures as necessary to reduce their respective impacts on library facilities. Therefore, the Project would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact with regard to libraries.

- **Traffic**—Traffic from future related projects has been incorporated into the traffic analysis for the Project. As set forth above, the Project would not result in significant traffic impacts under future conditions that include ambient growth and growth from related projects. Thus, the Project's traffic impacts would not be cumulatively considerable.

- **Tribal Cultural Resources**—As discussed above, the Project would not result in any impacts to tribal cultural resources. Each related project in the Project vicinity would be required to comply with AB 52, which requires a lead agency to notify and consult with tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of a proposed project. As part of the environmental review processes for the related projects, it is expected that mitigation measures would be established as necessary to address impacts to tribal cultural resources. Therefore, cumulative impacts to tribal cultural resources would be less than significant.

- **Water, Wastewater, and Stormwater Utilities**—Due to shared urban infrastructure, the Project and related projects would cumulatively increase water consumption, wastewater generation, and stormwater discharge. However, utility system capacity must be demonstrated during the approval process for each related project. As the service providers conduct ongoing evaluations to ensure that facilities are adequate to serve the forecasted growth of the community, cumulative impacts on utilities are concluded to be less than significant.

- **Solid Waste**—The Project in conjunction with related projects would increase the need for solid waste disposal. According to the County of San Diego Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan, the County anticipates that future disposal needs can be adequately met. Furthermore, the County of San Diego conducts ongoing evaluations to ensure that landfill capacity is adequate to serve the forecasted disposal needs of the region. Therefore, cumulative impacts with regards to solid waste are concluded to be less than significant.

- **Energy**—Development of the Project and related projects would increase the use of electricity, natural gas, and transportation fuels. Nevertheless, as required by the City of Escondido, all related projects would incorporate Title 24 Energy Efficiency Standards into their project design. Further, traffic demand management strategies likely would be implemented, as appropriate and required, for large-scale related projects in order to reduce vehicle miles travelled and associated fuel consumption. Therefore, cumulative energy impacts would be less than significant.

Based on the above, the Project would not result in any significant cumulatively considerable impacts. No further mitigation measures beyond the Project-specific mitigation provided above are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Less Than Significant Impact. Based on the analysis presented above, implementation of the Project would not result insubstantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.