S.0 Executive Summary

S.1 Project Synopsis

This summary provides a brief synopsis of: (1) the proposed El Cajon Downtown Specific Plan (ECDSP) project, (2) the results of the environmental analysis contained within this Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR), (3) the alternatives to the proposed plan that were considered, and (4) the major areas of controversy and issues to be resolved by decision-makers. This summary does not contain the extensive background and analysis found throughout the individual chapters contained within the document. Therefore, the reader should review the entire document to fully understand the project and its environmental consequences.

S.1.1 Project Location and Setting

The proposed ECDSP project site is located within the City of El Cajon (City), within San Diego County, in southern California (see Figure 2-1). The proposed ECDSP area encompasses 541 acres, and is bordered generally by Interstate 8 (I-8) on the west and north, Lexington Avenue on the south, and Lincoln Avenue on the east. The ECDSP area is generally accessed by I-8 and State Route 67 (SR-67) located to the north. Adjacent communities include the cities of San Diego and La Mesa to the west; the city of Santee to the north; and unincorporated areas of the County of San Diego to the north, east, and south (see Figure 2-2).

As shown in the aerial photograph of the project location (see Figure 2-3), the ECDSP area is highly urbanized with vegetation that is primarily ornamental as associated with landscaping, parks, and streetscapes.

S.1.2 Project Description

S.1.2.1 Discretionary Actions

The following discretionary actions would be considered by the City Council.

1. Certify Final PEIR for ECDSP (includes adoption of Statement of Overriding Considerations and adoption of Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program).
2. Amend El Cajon General Plan:
    a. Land use map:

1) Expand Special Development Area No. 9 boundary to match ECDSP project area boundary;

2) Modify Special Development Area No. 10 boundary to delete properties that fall within ECDSP project area boundary; and

3) Delete Special Development Area No. 11.

b. Text:

1) Modify references to SDAs 9, 10, & 11 to reflect actions taken to amend land use map;

2) Clarify that SDAs replace ~~underlying~~previous land use designation(s);

3) Revise/delete text which:

(a) is no longer applicable after adoption of ECDSP; and/or

(b) hinders implementation of adopted ECDSP.

3. Rezone ECDSP project area to M-U (Mixed Use) zone.
4. Adopt ECDSP as an ordinance.
5. Amend SP 462 to delete from its governance all properties within its boundary that are located within the ECDSP project area. This would include a revision to the SP 462 land use map and applicable text.
6. Adopt ECDSP Design Guidelines. (Appendix A of ECDSP)
7. Adopt new street network and cross sections. (Appendix B of ECDSP).

S.1.2.2 Project Objectives

The proposed ECDSP is intended to implement the principles of smart growth and sustainable community planning, consistent with objectives outlined in the SANDAG Regional Comprehensive Plan and City of El Cajon General Plan.

The four overarching goals of the proposed ECDSP are as follows:

- Increase the City's economic health through revitalization of the downtown.
- Meet the City's future fair share regional housing goals through intensification of housing within the ECDSP area.
- Make the City the best possible place to live, work, shop, play, learn, and conduct business.

- Contribute to the environmental health of City residents through the application of land use plans and development standards that promote healthy living and sustainable development.

The nine objectives of the proposed ECDSP include:

1. Re-establish a traditional urban downtown street grid.
2. Create a downtown that is vertical and compact.
3. Enhance the built environment through superior design standards.
4. Facilitate a mixture of uses in each district.
5. Increase the amount and quality of housing opportunities downtown.
6. Establish an urban land use pattern and circulation system that supports walking, biking, and transit use.
7. Establish a pedestrian-friendly environment.
8. Promote economic and social vitality.
9. Establish a connected open space system.

S.1.2.3 Specific Plan

The vision of the proposed ECDSP is to create an urban hub that is pedestrian-friendly, vertical and compact, transit-supportive, sustainable, and aesthetically pleasing. It is intended to be a place where people want to live, work, shop, play, learn, and conduct business. The ECDSP contains five distinct planning Districts, each with a focused identity as distinguished from each other and indicated by its name. The ECDSP Districts are shown in Figure 3-2 and include: Historic Heart of the City District, Transit and Business District, Lifetime Learning District, Marketplace District, and Community Recreation District. Details of each District's unique characteristics are provided in Chapter 3.0, Section 3.3.1.

The projected buildout for each of the five proposed ECDSP Districts is outlined in the table below.

ECDSP DISTRICTS PROJECTED BUILDOUT SUMMARY

Land Use	Historic Heart	Transit & Business	Lifetime Learning	Marketplace	Community Recreation	TOTALS
Residential Units	4,703	3,655	3,100	1,586	8,089	21,133
Hotel Rooms	280	280	280	280	280	1,400
Office Square Footage	1,756,876	2,020,708	2,102,207	1,754,806	798,167	8,432,764
Retail Square Footage	526,288	576,145	451,852	465,073	399,709	2,419,067
Public Park/Plaza Acreage	7	3	6	3	7	26
Private Open Space/ Recreational Space Acreage	11	11	9	6	19	56
Parking Spaces (off street)	13,601	13,268	11,974	8,970	14,468	62,281
Bicycle Spaces (off street)	1,917	1,778	1,564	1,074	2,393	8,726

The proposed ECDSP contains six land use designations to be distributed throughout the five Districts (see Figure 3-3) that include: Civic/Institutional, Pedestrian Retail, Commercial Office, Office Research and Development, High Density Residential, and Open Space. The ECDSP land use designations would replace existing zoning use and development standards. These new mixed-use regulations would permit new intensified, mixed-use growth and revitalization within the ECDSP area. Existing non-conforming uses would be subject to special regulations. Details of these land use designations and regulations are discussed in Chapter 3.0, Section 3.3.3.

The ECDSP includes mobility improvements that would enhance automobile circulation as well as increase the ability of residents to move within the ECDSP area safely, and more easily without the use of a vehicle. Specifically, the proposed mobility system components include a: Ultimate Street Network Plan, Street and Alley Circulation Plan, Pedestrian Circulation Plan, Bicycle Circulation Plan, Mass Transit System Plan, and Parking Plan. These plans are detailed in Chapter 3.0, Section 3.3.4 and in Chapter 4.0, Section 4.3.

In addition, in its Chapter 7.0, the proposed ECDSP identifies infrastructure and public facility improvements needed to meet the projected growth envisioned by the plan. The plan provides conceptual estimates of the needs and costs associated with improvements such as public rights-of-way, undergrounding of utilities, water and sewer utilities, drainage facilities and solid waste, energy, and telecommunication systems. In

recognizing needed investments in streets, transit, parks, plazas, cultural facilities, and improvements to public services such as utilities, police, fire, and schools, the proposed ECDSP identifies what actions the City will need to take to fully implement the ECDSP after its adoption, including methods for funding planned capital improvements, and a tentative phasing plan for completion of these improvements. The Implementation Plan, including financing measures and other implementation strategies, are discussed in Chapter 8.0 of the ECDSP and in Section 3.3.6 of this PEIR. Chapter 10.0 of the ECDSP includes project approval procedures including design review requirements to ensure quality design and preservation of any designated historic structures and their setting, as well as conditions of project approval to ensure avoidance of archaeological and paleontological impacts during construction, and to ensure proper interior noise attenuation in building design.

The proposed ECDSP includes a set of companion Design Guidelines intended to support the City's vision for the ECDSP area. The Design Guidelines specifically relate to site planning, architecture, green tools to enhance and improve environmental performance, and recommendations for design of open space and plazas.

S.2 Summary of Significant Effects and Mitigation Measures that Reduce or Avoid the Significant Effects

The issues addressed in this PEIR include: land use, aesthetics and urban design, traffic and other mobilities circulation, noise, air quality, hydrology, water quality, geology and soils, cultural and paleontological resources, public services and utilities, population and housing, hazards, and global climate change. Table S-1, located at the end of this summary, includes the results of the environmental analysis completed for the proposed project and identifies those issues found to be significant. Table S-1 also includes mitigation measures to reduce and/or avoid the significant environmental effects, with a conclusion as to whether the impact is reduced to less than significant or remains significant and unmitigated.

S.3 Areas of Controversy

The Notice of Preparation (NOP) was distributed in March 19, 2009 for a 30-day public review and comment period and a public scoping meeting was held on April 1, 2009. Public comments were received on the NOP and from the scoping meeting that reflect potential controversy related to several environmental issues, all of which have been evaluated in this PEIR. The NOP, comment letters, and comment forms are attached to this PEIR as Appendix A.

The concerns expressed in these public forums regarding the proposed ECDSP primarily center around the issues of traffic congestion and parking, noise, aesthetics, and storm water ponding. These issues are analyzed in this PEIR, primarily in Chapter 4.0. Table S-1 provides a summary of the issues which were, after evaluation, determined to result in significant environmental effects from a CEQA perspective.

S.4 Issues to be Resolved by the City Council

The issues to be resolved by the decision-making body (in this case the City of El Cajon) are whether to adopt the ECDSP and how to mitigate significant effects created by its implementation. The City will decide if significant unmitigable impacts can be feasibly reduced and if the significant impacts associated with the environmental issues of land use, traffic, noise, air quality, geology, hydrology (ponding), public utilities (water supply and sewer capacity), hazardous materials, and global climate change have been fully mitigated below a level of significance. Lastly, the City will determine whether any alternative might meet the key objectives of the project while reducing its environmental impact.

S.5 Project Alternatives

Section 15126.6 of the State CEQA Guidelines requires the discussion of "a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project" and the evaluation of the comparative merits of the alternatives. The alternatives discussion is intended to "focus on alternatives to the project or its location which are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant effects of the project," even if these alternatives would impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives.

The EIR addresses two No Project Alternatives: the No Project-No Build Alternative and the No Project-No Change in Existing Plans Alternative. Additional alternatives analyzed include the Reduced Project Area Alternative and the Reduced Building Height/Reduced Density Alternative. Alternatives to the proposed project are evaluated in full in Chapter 9.0 of this document.

S.5.1 No Project-No Build Alternative

The No Project-No Build Alternative reflects existing conditions with no further development occurring within the ECDSP area. Under the No Project-No Build Alternative, residential density within the downtown would remain low in comparison to the proposed project; the existing dwelling count in the 541-acre project area is

approximately 3,242 units. Under this alternative, dwelling units would remain segregated from the commercial and civic uses. Retail uses would remain the dominant land use. Thus, the project objective of creating a compact, pedestrian friendly, mixed-use urban downtown would not be met. While the existing conditions integrate some office and retail functions, the downtown area under this alternative would not include enough residential units to support a true mixed-use concept. As such, increased transit ridership and density necessary to support other alternative non-motorized mobility improvements would not occur.

While this alternative would lessen or avoid the significant impacts identified as occurring for land use, traffic, noise, air quality, hydrology, public services, and greenhouse gas emissions under the proposed ECDSP, it would not improve the community connectivity, aesthetics, water quality, housing supply, or alternative transportation features of the ECDSP area as would the proposed ECDSP.

This alternative would also fall short of most of the project's objectives. The ECDSP's objectives include creating an urban grid street system, creating a vertical and compact downtown area, increasing the amount and quality of housing opportunities, establishing a non-motorized circulation system through a pedestrian friendly environment, and promoting economic and social vitality within the City's downtown. Through retaining the existing street system that includes poor connectivity and automobile-focused streetscapes, the No Project-No Build Alternative would not meet objectives for enhanced walkability and a pedestrian-friendly downtown. By retaining the existing housing stock, alternative housing options would not to be provided in the downtown area. In addition, through retaining the existing housing stock in a largely suburban, low density pattern, the nearby commercial corridors and civic center would continue to be underutilized by neighborhood foot traffic.

S.5.2 No Project-No Change in Existing Plans Alternative

The No Project-No Change in Existing Plans Alternative considers the situation where development within the ECDSP area would follow the General Plan and two existing specific plans, SP182 and SP462. Under buildout of this alternative, residential and commercial office uses would be substantially less than the proposed ECDSP, while commercial retail space would be approximately the same. Given that the current downtown is nearly built out in accordance with the existing plans, its environmental effects compared to the proposed ECDSP would be fairly similar to the No Project – No Build Alternative and would lessen or avoid the significant traffic, noise, air quality, public services, and greenhouse gas emissions impacts identified for the proposed ECDSP.

As with the No Project-No Build Alternative, this alternative would not create an integrated mixed use urban center, where people live and work within close proximity,

and would instead allow buildout of largely segregated single-uses, with an emphasis on commercial development. As such, it would not improve community connectivity nor urban design to the extent the proposed ECDSP would. Also, the non-motorized mobility improvements envisioned in the ECDSP would not likely occur to the same degree as under this alternative, due to the comparatively low downtown resident population and thus demand for the improvements.

This alternative would also fail to meet most of the other objectives of the proposed ECDSP. While development under the existing specific plans allows for a pedestrian friendly land use pattern and some mixed uses, it would not implement superior design standards, increase residential housing, or promote economic and social vitality to the same degree as the ECDSP. Additionally, because park lands would not be developed within the downtown area under this alternative, the ECDSP objective of establishing a connected open space system would not occur.

S.5.3 Reduced Project Area Alternative

This alternative focuses on a reduced area of redevelopment that would encompass four instead of five new planning Districts. The area designated as the Marketplace District in the proposed ECDSP would not be included in this alternative's planning area. Thus, under this alternative, 1,586 fewer residential units would be allowed, and 465,073 square feet less of retail and 1,754,805 square feet less of office space would be available. Like the proposed project, the Reduced Project Area Alternative would provide cohesiveness through a compact, high density, and transit focused plan that would improve community connectivity, aesthetics, pedestrian and bicycle circulation, water quality, and housing opportunities. However, this alternative would provide fewer economic opportunities than the proposed plan given its reduction in commercial retail and office space and loss of the commercial corridor redevelopment opportunities associated with the Marketplace District.

The Reduced Project Area alternative would not satisfy the most primary goal of the proposed ECDSP related to the revitalization of the economic health of the downtown area to the same degree as the proposed project. Although environmental impacts associated with the proposed ECDSP would occur to a lesser degree under buildout of this alternative, the Reduced Project Area Alternative would not be considered the environmentally superior alternative. While this alternative would reduce the number of ADTs generated in the project area by approximately 26,071, thereby lessening impacts associated with traffic (such as noise, greenhouse gas emissions, air quality, and roadway and intersection congestion), significant unmitigated noise, air quality, greenhouse gas, and traffic (intersection, street and freeway segments) impacts would still occur.

S.5.4 Reduced Building Height/ Reduced Density Alternative

The Reduced Building Height/Reduced Density Alternative entails a reduction in the maximum height allowance in the Residential category within the Community Recreation District, from eight to three stories. It also entails a reduction in residential density through a change in land use designation from RH-2 (allowing 30 dwellings per acre) to RH-1 (allowing 20 dwellings per acre). Overall, this would reduce the allowable number of residential units by 5,813, or approximately 27 percent. All other land uses would remain the same as the proposed project. Thus, in addition to allowing 15,320 residential units, this alternative would provide redevelopment opportunities that could result in up to 8,432,764 square feet of office space and 2,419,067 square feet of retail space. The number of ADTs generated in the project area by this alternative would be approximately 35,458 less compared to the proposed project and 9,387 less compared to the Reduced Project Area Alternative.

Most of the project objectives would be met through implementation of this alternative as it would provide cohesiveness through a compact, high density, and transit-focused plan that would improve community connectivity, aesthetics, pedestrian and bicycle circulation, water quality, and housing opportunities. However, this alternative would not provide as great an opportunity for increasing housing supply to meet regional housing goals due to the decreased number of housing opportunities allowed within the planning area. This alternative would also still generate the significant environmental effects identified for the proposed project including effects on land use, traffic, noise, air quality and greenhouse gas emissions; however to a lesser extent. This alternative would also, by virtue of its reduced building heights, impose less of a visual contrast to the existing environment. However, aesthetics and urban design were not found to be a significant environmental impact of the proposed project either. The extent of mitigation required to avoid or lessen the significant impacts of the proposed project would also be reduced under this alternative. However, none of the significant and unmitigated impacts identified for the proposed project (air quality, noise, intersection, street and freeway segments, greenhouse gas emissions) would be avoided or reduced to below significance with mitigation.

S.5.5 Environmentally Superior Alternative

Due to the reduction of significant traffic generation (ADT) and its associated noise, greenhouse gas emissions, and air quality effects, as well as reduced visual contrast related to building heights, the Reduced Building Height/Reduced Density Alternative would be considered the environmentally superior alternative. However, while meeting many of the objectives of the proposed project, this alternative would not increase the amount and quality of housing supply to the same degree as the proposed project. It

would also reduce the number of potential patrons to downtown businesses that would be within walking or biking distance.

TABLE S-1
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

Environmental Issue	Results of Impact Analysis	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
TRAFFIC CIRCULATION			
Would the proposed project result in an increase in project traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system?	***Project Area Intersections*** Under Year 2030 "Build" conditions, significant impacts would occur at the following intersections: • Marshall Avenue/ Main Street • Johnson Avenue/ Madison Avenue • Chase Avenue/ I-8 EB Off-Ramp • Magnolia Avenue/ Madison Avenue	***Marshall Avenue/ Main Street*** 4.3.5.1-1: Restripe the northbound approach to provide an exclusive left-turn lane and a shared thru/right-turn lane. Modify the traffic signal to provide a protected north/south left-turn phase. (470-foot length required.) ***Johnson Avenue/ Madison Avenue*** [a] 4.3.5.1-2: Widen the intersection to provide dual southbound left-turn lanes. Two eastbound receiving lanes will need to be provided on Madison Avenue for about 500 feet. (440-foot length required on southbound approach.) ***Chase Avenue/ I-8 EB Off-Ramp*** [a] 4.3.5.1-3: Restripe the westbound approach to provide two through lanes and an exclusive right-turn lane. (170-foot length required.) ***Magnolia Avenue/ Madison Avenue*** [a] 4.3.5.1-4: Widen the intersection to provide the following lane geometry: ▪ Westbound: One left-turn lane, one thru lane and one right-turn lane with a right-turn overlap phase (450-foot length required). ▪ Eastbound: Dual left-turn lanes and one shared thru/right-turn lane (450-foot length required.) To achieve an LOS D or better, mitigation would additionally require the following southbound and northbound lane geometry: ▪ Southbound: Dual left-turn lanes, two thru lanes and one shared thru/right-turn lane (270-foot length required). ▪ Northbound: Dual left-turn lanes, two thru lanes and one shared thru/right-turn lane (580-foot length required). However, the City finds that widening the southbound and northbound lanes to three through-lanes, six lanes total, would not be feasible given right-of-way constraints and the City's vision for an urban, walkable downtown. No other feasible mitigation measures are available to reduce intersection LOS impacts to below significance. Projects impacts are therefore considered significant and unmitigated.	Less than Significant Less than Significant Less than Significant Significant and Unmitigated
Would the proposed project result in an increase in project	***Project Area Street Segments*** Under Year 2030 "Build" conditions, significant impacts	***El Cajon Boulevard between I-8 WB Ramps and Marshall Avenue*** [a] 4.3.5.2-1: 1. Analyze intersections on either end of segment. If LOS D or "better", no	Less than Significant

TABLE S-1
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS
(Continued)

Environmental Issue	Results of Impact Analysis	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system?	would occur along the following street segments and freeway segments: <u>North/South Roadways</u> • El Cajon Boulevard between I-8 WB Ramps and Marshall Avenue • Marshall Avenue between El Cajon Boulevard and Palm Avenue • Marshall Avenue between Palm Avenue and Main Street • Johnson Avenue between El Cajon Boulevard and Main Street • Magnolia Avenue between Park Avenue and Wells Avenue • Magnolia Avenue between Madison Avenue and the I-8 Ramps <u>East/West Roadways</u> • Lexington Avenue between Claydelle Avenue and Avocado Avenue • Lexington Avenue between Avocado Avenue and Taft Avenue • Main Street between the I-8 EB Ramps to Marshall Avenue • Main Street between El Cajon Boulevard and Avocado Avenue / Ballantyne Street • Madison Avenue between	improvement necessary. If LOS E/F calculated at either intersection, assess the existing intersection signal timing.* 2. Analyze intersections on either end of segment. If LOS D or "better", no improvement necessary. If LOS E/F calculated at either intersection, restripe the westbound approach at the Chase Avenue/I-8 Eastbound Off-ramp to provide two through lanes and an exclusive right-turn lane. 3. Analyze intersections on either end of segment. If LOS D or "better", no improvement necessary. If LOS E/F calculated at either intersection, widen segment to 6 lanes. ***Marshall Avenue between El Cajon Boulevard and Palm Avenue*** [a] 4.3.5.2-2: 1. Analyze intersections on either end of segment. If LOS D or "better", no improvement necessary. If LOS E/F calculated at either intersection, assess the existing intersection signal timing.* 2. Analyze intersections on either end of segment. If LOS D or "better", no improvement necessary. If LOS E/F calculated at either intersection, improve the Marshall Avenue/ Palm Avenue intersection to provide second northbound and southbound thru lanes. The second lane could be dropped a few hundred feet north and south of the intersection. The northbound and southbound approaches should provide one left-turn lane, one thru lane and one shared through right-turn lane. 3. Analyze intersections on either end of segment. If LOS D or "better", no improvement necessary. If LOS E/F calculated at either intersection, widen segment to 4 lanes. ***Marshall Avenue between Palm Avenue and Main Street*** [a] 4.3.5.2-3: 1. Analyze intersections on either end of segment. If LOS D or "better", no improvement necessary. If LOS E/F calculated at either intersection, assess the existing intersection signal timing.* 2. Analyze intersections on either end of segment. If LOS D or "better", no improvement necessary. If LOS E/F calculated at either intersection, restripe the northbound approach of the Marshall Avenue/Main Street intersection to provide an exclusive left-turn lane and one shared thru/right-turn lane. 3. Analyze intersections on either end of segment. If LOS D or "better", no improvement necessary. If LOS E/F calculated at either intersection, widen segment to 4 lanes.	<u>Less than Significant</u> <u>Less than Significant</u>

TABLE S-1
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS
(Continued)

Environmental Issue	Results of Impact Analysis	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
	Johnson Avenue and Chambers Street • Madison Avenue between Chambers Street and Magnolia Avenue • Madison Avenue between Magnolia Avenue and Ballantyne Street	***Johnson Avenue between El Cajon Boulevard and Main Street*** [a] 4.3.5.2-4: 1. Analyze intersections on either end of segment. If LOS D or "better", no improvement necessary. If LOS E/F calculated at either intersection, assess the existing intersection signal timing.* 2. Analyze intersections on either end of segment. If LOS D or "better", no improvement necessary. If LOS E/F calculated at either intersection, widen the northbound approach of the Johnson Avenue/Main Street intersection to provide a second northbound left-turn lane. 3. Analyze intersections on either end of segment. If LOS D or "better", no improvement necessary. If LOS E/F calculated at either intersection, widen segment to 4 lanes.	Less than Significant
		Magnolia Avenue between Park Avenue and Wells Avenue [a] 4.3.5.2-5: 1. Analyze intersections on either end of segment. If LOS D or "better", no improvement necessary. If LOS E/F calculated at either intersection, assess the existing intersection signal timing.* 2. Analyze intersections on either end of segment. If LOS D or "better", no improvement necessary. If LOS E/F calculated at either intersection, provide an exclusive southbound right-turn lane at the Magnolia Avenue/Park Avenue intersection. 3. Analyze intersections on either end of segment. If LOS D or "better", no improvement necessary. If LOS E/F calculated at either intersection, then mitigation would be necessary to widen the segment to 6 lanes to achieve an LOS D or better. However, widening the segment to 6 lanes would not be feasible given right-of-way constraints and the City's vision for an urban, walkable downtown. Therefore, if LOS E/F is calculated at either intersection, project impacts would be considered significant and unmitigated.	Significant and Unmitigated
		Magnolia Avenue between Madison Avenue and the I-8 Ramps [a] 4.3.5.2-6: 1. Analyze intersections on either end of segment. If LOS D or "better", no improvement necessary. If LOS E/F calculated at either intersection, assess the existing intersection signal timing.* 2. Analyze intersections on either end of segment. If LOS D or "better", no improvement necessary. If LOS E/F calculated at either intersection, widen the Magnolia Avenue/Madison Avenue intersection to provide the following lane	Significant and Unmitigated

TABLE S-1
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS
(Continued)

Environmental Issue	Results of Impact Analysis	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
		geometry: •~~Southbound: Dual left-turn lanes, two thru lanes and one shared thru/right-turn lane~~ • Westbound: One left-turn lane, one thru lane and one right-turn lane with a right-turn overlap phase •~~Northbound: Dual left-turn lanes, two thru lanes and one shared thru/right-turn lane~~ • Eastbound: Dual left-turn lanes and one shared thru/right-turn lane Intersection LOS D or better would not be achieved with improvements only to the westbound and eastbound lanes. To achieve LOS D at this intersection, it would be necessary to widen the southbound and northbound lanes. However, such widening would be infeasible given roadway width and walkable streetscape design constraints. 3. Analyze intersections on either end of segment. If LOS D or "better", no improvement necessary. If LOS E/F calculated at either intersection, then mitigation would be necessary to widen the segment to 6 lanes to achieve an LOS D or better. However, widening the segment to 6 lanes would not be feasible given right-of-way constraints and the City's vision for an urban, walkable downtown. Therefore, if LOS E/F is calculated at either intersection, project impacts would be considered significant and unmitigated.	
		Lexington Avenue between Claydelle Avenue and Avocado Avenue[a] 4.3.5.2-7 1. Analyze intersections on either end of segment. If LOS D or "better", no improvement necessary. If LOS E/F calculated at either intersection, assess the existing intersection signal timing.* 2. Analyze intersections on either end of segment. If LOS D or "better", no improvement necessary. If LOS E/F calculated at either intersection, restripe the Lexington Avenue/Claydelle Avenue intersection to provide dedicated eastbound and westbound left-turn lanes. 3. Analyze intersections on either end of segment. If LOS D or "better", no improvement necessary. If LOS E/F calculated at either intersection, widen segment to 4 lanes.	Less than Significant
		Lexington Avenue between Avocado Avenue and Taft Avenue[a] 4.3.5.2-8 1. Analyze intersections on either end of segment. If LOS D or "better", no improvement necessary. If LOS E/F calculated at either intersection, assess the	Less than Significant

TABLE S-1
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS
(Continued)

Environmental Issue	Results of Impact Analysis	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
		existing intersection signal timing.* 2. Analyze intersections on either end of segment. If LOS D or "better", no improvement necessary. If LOS E/F calculated at either intersection, restripe the Lexington Avenue/Taft Avenue intersection to provide dedicated eastbound and westbound left-turn lanes. 3. Analyze intersections on either end of segment. If LOS D or "better", no improvement necessary. If LOS E/F calculated at either intersection, widen segment to 4 lanes.	
		Main Street between the I-8 EB Ramps to Marshall Avenue [a] 4.3.5.2-9: 1. Analyze intersections on either end of segment. If LOS D or "better", no improvement necessary. If LOS E/F calculated at either intersection, assess the existing intersection signal timing.* 2. Analyze intersections on either end of segment. If LOS D or "better", no improvement necessary. If LOS E/F calculated at either intersection, restripe the northbound approach of the Main Street/Marshall Avenue intersection to provide an exclusive left-turn lane and one shared thru/right-turn lane. Modify the traffic signal to provide a protected north/south phase. 3. Analyze intersections on either end of segment. If LOS D or "better", no improvement necessary. If LOS E/F calculated at either intersection, widen segment to 6 lanes.	Less than Significant
		Main Street between El Cajon Boulevard and Avocado Avenue / Ballantyne Street [a] 4.3.5.2-10: 1. Analyze intersections on either end of segment. If LOS D or "better", no improvement necessary. If LOS E/F calculated at either intersection, assess the existing intersection signal timing.* 2. Analyze intersections on either end of segment. If LOS D or "better", no improvement necessary. If LOS E/F calculated at either intersection, provide a second eastbound thru lane at the El Cajon Boulevard/Main Street intersection. 3. Analyze intersections on either end of segment. If LOS D or "better", no improvement necessary. If LOS E/F calculated at either intersection, then mitigation would be necessary to widen the segment to 4 lanes to achieve an LOS D or better. However, widening the segment to 4 lanes would not be feasible given right-of-way constraints and the City's vision for an urban, walkable downtown. Therefore, if LOS E/F is calculated at either intersection,	Significant and Unmitigated

TABLE S-1
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS
(Continued)

Environmental Issue	Results of Impact Analysis	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
		project impacts would be considered significant and unmitigated.	
		Madison Avenue between Johnson Avenue and Chambers Street [a] 4.3.5.2-11: 1. Analyze intersections on either end of segment. If LOS D or "better", no improvement necessary. If LOS E/F calculated at either intersection, assess the existing intersection signal timing.* 2. Analyze intersections on either end of segment. If LOS D or "better", no improvement necessary. If LOS E/F calculated at either intersection, widen the Johnson Avenue/Madison Avenue intersection to provide dual southbound left-turn lanes. Two eastbound receiving lanes would need to be provided on Madison Avenue for a length of approximately 500 feet. 3. Analyze intersections on either end of segment . If LOS D or "better", no improvement necessary. If LOS E/F calculated at either intersection, widen segment to 4 lanes OR construct an alternative east/west roadway that connects Magnolia Avenue with Johnson Avenue, such as an extension of Park Avenue from Chambers Street to Johnson Avenue. This proposed connection will alleviate Madison Avenue by displacing traffic onto a parallel road.	Less than Significant
		Madison Avenue between Chambers Street and Magnolia Avenue [a] 4.3.5.2-12: 1. Analyze intersections on either end of segment. If LOS D or "better", no improvement necessary. If LOS E/F calculated at either intersection, assess the existing intersection signal timing.* 2. Analyze intersections on either end of segment. If LOS D or "better", no improvement necessary. If LOS E/F calculated at either intersection, widen the Magnolia Avenue/Madison Avenue intersection to provide the following lane geometry: • ~~Southbound: Dual left-turn lanes, two thru lanes and one shared thru/right-turn lane~~ • Westbound: One left-turn lane, one thru lane and one right-turn lane with a right-turn overlap phase • ~~Northbound: Dual left-turn lanes, two thru lanes and one shared thru/right-turn lane~~ • Eastbound: Dual left-turn lanes and one shared thru/right-turn lane To achieve an LOS D or better it may also be necessary to widen the northbound and southbound lanes of this intersection to 6 lanes. However, this would not be feasible given right-of-way constraints and the City's vision for an urban,	Less Than Significant

TABLE S-1
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS
(Continued)

Environmental Issue	Results of Impact Analysis	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
		walkable downtown. Therefore, if LOS E/F is calculated at either intersection after implementing the westbound and eastbound lane improvements, segment impacts would be significant until the following occurs: 3. Analyze intersections on either end of segment. If LOS D or "better", no improvement necessary. If LOS E/F calculated at either intersection, widen segment to 4 lanes OR construct an alternative east/west roadway that that connects Magnolia Avenue with Johnson Avenue, such as an extension of Park Avenue from Chambers Street to Johnson Avenue. This proposed connection will alleviate Madison Avenue by displacing traffic onto a parallel road. ***Madison Avenue between Magnolia Avenue and Ballantyne Street*** [a] 4.3.5.2-13: 1. Analyze intersections on either end of segment. If LOS D or "better", no improvement necessary. If LOS E/F calculated at either intersection, assess the existing intersection signal timing.* 2. Analyze intersections on either end of segment. If LOS D or "better", no improvement necessary. If LOS E/F calculated at either intersection, widen the Magnolia Avenue/Madison Avenue intersection to provide the following lane geometry: • ~~Southbound: Dual left-turn lanes, two thru lanes and one shared thru/right-turn lane~~ • Westbound: One left-turn lane, one thru lane and one right-turn lane with a right-turn overlap phase • ~~Northbound: Dual left-turn lanes, two thru lanes and one shared thru/right-turn lane~~ • Eastbound: Dual left-turn lanes and one shared thru/right-turn lane To achieve an LOS D or better it may also be necessary to widen the northbound and southbound lanes of this intersection to 6 lanes. However, this would not be feasible given right-of-way constraints and the City's vision for an urban, walkable downtown. Therefore, if LOS E/F is calculated at either intersection after implementing the westbound and eastbound lane improvements, segment impacts would be considered significant until the following occurs: 3. Analyze intersections on either end of segment. If LOS D or "better", no improvement necessary. If LOS E/F calculated at either intersection, widen segment to 4 lanes	Less Than Significant
		Footnotes:	

TABLE S-1
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS
(Continued)

Environmental Issue	Results of Impact Analysis	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
		[a] Not feasible to provide full mitigation with existing City right-of-way. This could require the exercise, by the City, of its powers of eminent domain in the acquisition of private properties, including entire parcels where right-of-way may significantly reduce the usefulness of the remaining portions of the parcels. * The assessment of the existing signal timing could include such items as ensuring the timing is based on up-to-date traffic volumes and patterns, ensuring the signal timing is responsive to the different volumes throughout the day (i.e. morning, midday, afternoon, evening), ensuring detector loops are operating adequately, and ensuring the timing is coordinated with adjacent traffic signals.	
	Project Area Freeway ~~Segments~~ • Interstate 8 between Chase Avenue/El Cajon Boulevard and Mollison Avenue segment • State Route 67 between I-8 and Bradley Avenue segment • Interstate 8 Eastbound Off-Ramp/Magnolia Avenue (Southbound) Intersection	***Interstate 8 between Chase Avenue/El Cajon Boulevard and Mollison Avenue*** 4.3.5.3-1: According to the 2007 SANDAG Regional Transportation Plan, there are currently no "revenue constrained" or "reasonably expected" improvements to occur to this portion of I-8. Therefore, the impact is not mitigated. ***State Route 67 between I-8 and Bradley Avenue*** 4.3.5.3-2: According to the 2007 SANDAG Regional Transportation Plan, there are currently no "revenue constrained" or "reasonably expected" improvements to occur to this portion of SR-67. Therefore, the impact is not mitigated. According to the 2007 SANDAG RTP, there are currently no improvements scheduled to occur to the affected portions of the I-8 or SR-67. It should be noted that Caltrans is currently working on a project to add an additional lane on I-8 between Second Street and Greenfield Drive, which may provide some benefit to eastbound traffic. At this time, however, no mitigation is available to address project related impacts. ***Interstate 8 Eastbound Off-Ramp/Magnolia Avenue (Southbound) Intersection*** 4.3.5.3-3 The City shall conduct a traffic signal warrant analysis at the I-8 Eastbound Off-Ramp/Magnolia Avenue (Southbound) intersection within the first five years of the adoption of the Downtown Specific Plan. Every three years thereafter the City shall conduct a traffic signal warrant analysis at the subject intersection. If signal warrants are met, the City shall install a traffic signal at the intersection for the eastbound right-turn movement and the southbound through movement (the northbound movement on Magnolia Avenue shall remain independent from the	Significant and Unmitigated Significant and Unmitigated Less than Significant

TABLE S-1
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS
(Continued)

Environmental Issue	Results of Impact Analysis		Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
		signalization of this intersection).		
Would the project result in inadequate parking capacity?	***Parking Capacity*** localized parking impacts due to the demand for retail parking not provided on-site as development within the ECDSP area progresses could be significant if public parking structures are not timed to meet need as the need arises.	4.3.5.4-1	Individual projects shall be conditioned to provide required parking for retail uses on-site if the on-street parking demand within the District has reached 70 percent occupancy during peak business hours (as determined by the City Traffic Engineer), unless the City has committed to construct a public parking facility in that District within three years of reaching the 70 percent threshold.	Less than Significant
		4.3.5.4-2	The City shall incorporate in its Way Finding Sign Program information directing motorists to nearby public lots and public parking facilities.	

THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY BLANK.