EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This summary provides a brief synopsis of the project description and results of the environmental analysis contained within the Forrester Creek Industrial Creek Environmental Impact Report (EIR) prepared by the City of El Cajon. By necessity, this summary does not contain the extensive background and analysis found in the EIR document. Therefore, the reader should review the entire document to fully understand the proposed project and its environmental consequences.

PROJECT LOCATION

The 31.5-acre proposed project site is located at the northwest corner of Weld Boulevard and Cuyamaca Street in El Cajon, California. The City of El Cajon/City of Santee jurisdictional boundary is coincident with the northern and northwestern site property lines. The site is bounded by industrial and residential land uses in the City of Santee to the north and northwest, respectively. The remainder of the site is bounded by land uses within the City of El Cajon, including the County Operations Facility to the southwest, Weld Boulevard to the south, Cuyamaca Street to the east and a channelized section of Forrester Creek to the northeast. The site is also part of the Gillespie Field Airport, and is owned by the County of San Diego.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed development would consist of approximately 463,000 square feet (SF) of multi-tenant industrial space, combining light industrial and warehouse uses. The project would be constructed in three phases. The conceptual design of the project site is described below.

Phase I would include approximately 196,500 SF of industrial building space on the southeastern portion of the site. Phase I includes Buildings A (approximately 60,650 SF) and B (approximately 135,852 SF). Building A would be a single-story linear, north-south trending structure with a slight bend near the center of the building. The L-shaped Building B would provide 99,996 SF on the first floor and the remaining 35,856 SF would be provided in a future mezzanine level. Both buildings would be constructed for manufacturing uses. The two buildings would be oriented in a U-shape pattern with the loading docks on the interior of the U-shape and parking spaces surrounding the exterior of the U-shape. Approximately 115 parking spaces would be provided for Building A and 303 parking spaces would be provided for Building B.

Phase II would consist of Building C, a 191,473 SF industrial building located in the northwestern portion of the site. Approximately 181,240 SF would be provided on the first floor and 10,233 SF would be provided in a future mezzanine level. Building C would be a linear, west-east trending structure with a

mezzanine at the southeast corner. Loading docks would be located along the northern side of the building. Approximately 237 parking spaces would be provided to the north, west and south of Building C.

Phase III would include the construction of Building D, a 75,000 SF rectangular structure located in the western portion of the site. Approximately 65,538 SF would be provided on the first floor and 9,462 SF would be provided in a future mezzanine at the northeast corner of the building. Loading docks would be located along the southern building perimeter. Phase III would include 138 parking spaces located to the north, west and south of Building D.

The project also proposes site access and circulation improvements, including the construction of a northern leg of the Gillespie Way/Weld Boulevard intersection. The project would implement low water use landscaping, utilities improvements and extensions, and water quality Best Management Practices. In addition, a six-foot high perimeter wall would be constructed along the northern and western project property line to provide a district boundary between the proposed industrial park and adjacent residential uses. Retaining walls would also be constructed within the site and along the northeastern perimeter of the project site.

PROJECT APPROVALS

Approval of the Forrester Creek Industrial Park project would require the approval of a number of discretionary actions. According to Sections 15050 and 15367 of the CEQA Guidelines, the City of El Cajon is designated as the Lead Agency for the project. Responsible agencies are those agencies that have discretionary approval authority over one or more actions involved with the development of a proposed project. Trustee agencies are state agencies having jurisdiction by law over natural resources affected by a proposed project that are held in trust of the people of the State of California. The following list indicates the various discretionary actions that would be required to implement the proposed project and the agencies that would grant discretionary approval for these actions.

- Grading Permit, Building Permit, and Street Improvement Plan by the El Cajon City Staff
- Tentative Subdivision Map, Planned Unit Development, General Plan Amendment, Amendment of Specific Plan 291, and Rezoning Approval by the El Cajon Planning Commission and City Council
- Industrial Storm Water Permit by the El Cajon Public Works Department
- Approval of a long-term lease agreement by County of San Diego (completed)
- National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Construction Activities Storm Water General Permit by the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB)
- Clean Water Act Section 401 Water Quality Certification by the RWQCB
- Army Corps of Engineers Section 404 Permit
- California Department of Fish and Game Section 1602 Permit
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Endangered Species Act Section 7 or 10(a) compliance
- Federal Aviation Administration Airspace Determination Letter (completed)
- San Diego County Regional Airport Authority Consistency Determination (completed)

AREAS OF CONTROVERSY KNOWN TO THE LEAD AGENCY

CEQA Guidelines Section 15123(b)(2) requires that areas of controversy known to the Lead Agency (the City of El Cajon) be stated in the EIR summary. Comments on the Notice of Preparation (NOP) prepared for the project were received from one federal agency (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service), five state agencies (California Department of Fish and Game, Caltrans, Department of Toxic Substances Control, Native American Heritage Commission, and the Public Utilities Commission), and two County agencies (SANDAG and the County of San Diego Department of Public Works). A joint letter from U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and California Department of Fish and Game offered recommendations and comments to assist the City in avoiding, minimizing, and mitigating project-related impacts to biological resources and to ensure that the project is consistent with on-going regional habitat conservation planning efforts. Caltrans requested an analysis of airport-related noise and safety impacts to the proposed project, as well as compliance with regional airport land use planning regulations. Caltrans also requested that a traffic impact study be prepared for the proposed project to determine the project's near-term and long-term impacts to State facilities and propose appropriate mitigation measures. The Department of Toxic Substances Control letter provided comments regarding the project's potential impacts associated with hazardous materials and the NAHC requested that the EIR address potential impacts to cultural resources. The Public Utilities Commission letter recommended that the project be planned with the safety of the adjacent San Diego Metropolitan Transit System rail corridor in mind. The SANDAG letter recommended that the proposed project utilize the proximity of the project to the San Diego Trolley and reduce the demand for automobile capacity. The County of San Diego Department of Public Works requested that a traffic impact study be prepared for the proposed project to determine the project's near-term and long-term impacts to San Diego County's facilities and propose appropriate mitigation measures.

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15083, an early public consultation meeting was held at the City of El Cajon on February 7, 2006. During that meeting, property owners of residences located west of the project site in the City of Santee expressed concerns about air quality, night lighting, and noise. All of the issues raised during the NOP comment period and at the early public consultation meeting have been addressed in the EIR (see Chapters 4.1 through 4.13).

ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED BY THE DECISION MAKING BODY

The issues to be resolved by the decision making body include whether and how to mitigate the significant effects of the proposed project; consideration of the various mitigation measures and alternatives recommended in the EIR by City staff and interested persons and organizations; whether the benefits of the proposed project outweigh its unavoidable environmental risk; and whether the discretionary approvals required to implement the proposed project and its development components should be granted.

IMPACT AND ALTERNATIVES SUMMARY

Table S-1 summarizes the impacts associated with the proposed project and the mitigation measures required to reduce the impacts to below significant levels. Only significant environmental issues that require the implementation of mitigation measures are identified in this table. Table S-2 provides a summary of the project alternatives analysis.

Table S-1. Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Issue Area	Significant Impact(s)	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance of Impact(s) After Mitigation*
4.2 Air Quality			
Pollutant Emissions	Implementation of the proposed project would result in a potentially significant impact from the exceedance of the NO_x daily emissions threshold in 2012 due to simultaneous project construction of Phase 3 and operation of Phases 1 and 2.	***Air-1*** During project construction, the construction contractor shall be required to ensure that construction equipment is maintained in good tune and that excessive idling time is minimized. This shall be made a requirement of the construction contract and be verified by City Planning staff prior to the issuance of a grading permit for the construction of Phase 3. ***Air-2*** During the simultaneous construction of Phase 3 and operation of Phases 1 and 2, the construction contractor shall limit daily construction hours to approximately 4 hours per day, in order to reduce emissions below the daily significance level threshold for NO_x. This shall be made a requirement of the construction contract and be verified by City Planning staff prior to the issuance of a grading permit for the construction of Phase 3. Although mitigation measure Air-2 would reduce impacts to below a level of significance, it is considered to be infeasible by the City of El Cajon because it would double the duration of construction for Phase 3 from 11 months to 22 months. This would result in an economic impact to the project applicant by significantly increasing the cost of construction of Phase 3. In addition, it would negatively affect the residential properties to the west of the project site that are adjacent to the Phase 3 construction area, by exposing them to nuisance noise and dust from construction for an additional 11 months. Because mitigation measure Air-2 is considered to be infeasible, the following mitigation measure would be implemented that would reduce emissions of NO_x from simultaneous project construction and operational activities. ***Air-3*** During the simultaneous construction of Phase 3 and operation of Phases 1 and 2, the construction contractor shall use at least 10 percent Tier I, II, or III certified equipment as approved by the California Air Resources Board. This shall be made a requirement of the construction contract and be verified by City Planning staff prior to the issuance of a grading permit for the construction of Phase 3. Due to the potential mix of construction equipment from Tiers 1, 2 and 3 that may be used, it not possible to quantify the emissions reduction that would occur from implementation of mitigation measure Air-3. Therefore, while measures Air-1 and Air-3 would reduce the emissions of NO_x during simultaneous project construction and operation activities, the project may still result in emissions levels that exceed the allowable daily emissions threshold for NO_x. Therefore, although reduced, impacts would be potentially significant and unavoidable.	Significant and unavoidable

Issue Area	Significant Impact(s)	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance of Impact(s) After Mitigation*
4.3 Biological Resources			
Sensitive Species, Habitats and Populations	Implementation of the proposed project would result in a significant impact to disturbed Diegan coastal sage scrub, San Diego ambrosia, and non-native grassland habitat. In addition, the project would result in a significant direct impact to raptor foraging habitat including non-native grassland and raptor nesting habitat including eucalyptus woodland. The project would also result in a significant direct impact to OWUS and State-regulated waters. Indirect impacts from construction noise to local wildlife would be significant if noise levels exceed 60 dB (A) L_{eq} in areas where raptors are nesting. Implementation of the proposed project would result in a significant impact to approximately 250 stems of San Diego ambrosia, which is a federally-endangered plant species. No impacts to federal or state-listed animal species would occur.	***Bio-1*** Impacts to 0.2 acres of disturbed Diegan coastal sage scrub shall be mitigated at a 1:1 ratio for a total of 0.2 acres of required mitigation. Mitigation shall consist of acquisition of 0.2 acres of Diegan coastal sage scrub. The wildlife agencies and the City shall approve the location and habitat quality of the off-site mitigation site. ***Bio-2*** Impacts to 15.6 acres of non-native grassland shall be mitigated at a 0.5:1 ratio for a total of 7.8 acres of required mitigation. Mitigation shall consist of off-site acquisition of 7.8 acres of non-native grassland. The wildlife agencies and the City shall approve the location and habitat quality of the off-site mitigation site. ***Bio-3*** Impacts to raptor foraging habitat shall be mitigated through implementation of mitigation measure Bio-2. Mitigation for impacts to raptor nesting habitat shall consist of the following: no clearing of eucalyptus woodland shall take place during the tree-nesting raptor breeding season (March 15 through August 31). If clearing is proposed to take place during the breeding season, a pre-construction survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist to determine if raptor nests (or nest building or other breeding/nesting behavior) occurs within the eucalyptus woodland. If there are no raptors nesting (which includes nest building or other breeding/nesting behavior) within this area, clearing shall be allowed to proceed. If raptors are observed nesting (or displaying breeding/nesting behavior), construction shall be postponed until a qualified biologist determines that all nesting (or breeding/nesting behavior) has ceased or until after August 31. ***Bio-4*** No grading or clearing within 500 feet of a raptor nest during the raptor breeding season (March 15 through August 31) shall occur. All grading permits, improvement plans, and final maps shall state the same. If clearing or grading would occur during the raptor breeding season (March 15 through August 31), a pre-construction survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist to determine if raptors occur within the areas impacted by noise. If there are no raptors nesting (which includes nest building or other breeding/nesting behavior) within this area, development shall be allowed to proceed. However, if raptors are observed nesting (or displaying breeding/nesting behavior) within 500 feet of construction activities, construction shall (1) be postponed until a qualified biologist determines that all nesting (or breeding/nesting behavior) has ceased or until after August 31; or (2) a temporary noise barrier or berm shall be constructed at the edge of the development footprint to ensure that noise levels are reduced to below 60 dB(A) Leq. Alternatively, the use of construction equipment could be scheduled to keep noise levels below 60 dB (A) Leq in lieu of or in concert with a wall or other noise barrier.	Less than significant

Issue Area	Significant Impact(s)	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance of Impact(s) After Mitigation*
		Bio-5 Authorization for the fill of jurisdictional waters of the U.S. shall be secured from the Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) through the Clean Water Act Section 404 permitting process before any fill is placed in jurisdictional waters of the U.S. Timing for compliance with the specific conditions of the Section 404 permit shall be in accordance with conditions specified by ACOE as part of permit issuance. As required by Section 404, approval and implementation of a wetland mitigation and monitoring plan would be expected to mitigate impacts on jurisdictional waters of the U.S., including jurisdictional wetlands. Mitigation approved by ACOE and the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board for impacts on jurisdictional waters of the US and State, and/or seasonal would be included in the same mitigation plan. Water Quality Certification pursuant to Section 401 of the Clean Water Act shall be required as a condition of issuance of the Section 404 permit. Before construction in any areas containing wetland features, the project proponent shall obtain water quality certification for the project. Any measures required, as part of the issuance of the water quality certification shall be implemented. Report of waste discharge pursuant to California Water Code Section 13050 shall be required for those waters of the state determined to be non-jurisdictional under Sections 404 and 401 of the Clean Water Act. Any measures required as part of the issuance of the report of waste discharge shall be implemented. Authorization for the alteration of streambeds and banks within the state shall be required under Section 1602 of the Fish and Game Code of California, and a Streambed Alteration Agreement will be required prior to work occurring in CDFG jurisdictional areas. All mitigation requirements determined through the process of obtaining the above permits shall be implemented. ***Bio-6*** Prior to the issuance of a site grading permit, impacts to San Diego ambrosia shall be mitigated through compliance with Section 7 or 10(a) of the federal Endangered Species Act which regulates actions that could jeopardize endangered or threatened species. A Section 7 permit is recommended, since there is most likely a nexus between the potential Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) jurisdictional areas and the federally listed San Diego ambrosia. Under the Section 7 process, a biological assessment shall be prepared in consultation with the ACOE and the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). Under this process, take authorization can be authorized via a letter of biological opinion issued by the USFWS. If a Section 7 permit can not be obtained, a Section 10(a) permit shall be obtained, which requires the preparation of a habitat conservation plan to demonstrate how the taking of the species would be minimized and how steps taken would ensure the species' survival. Under this process, the HCP shall be reviewed and approved by the USFWS prior to issuance of a grading permit on the project site.	

Issue Area	Significant Impact(s)	Mitigation Measure(s)		Significance of Impact(s) After Mitigation*
4.4 Cultural and Paleontological Resources				
Archaeological Sites and Human Remains	Implementation of the proposed project would have the potential to result in a significant impact if human remains are discovered on the project site during grading activities.	***Cul-1***	If human remains are found on the project site during grading or excavation, these finds shall be dealt with in accordance with State of California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and SB2641. This code section states that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made a determination of origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. The County Coroner shall be notified of the find immediately. If the human remains are determined to be prehistoric, the Coroner shall notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), which shall determine and notify a Most Likely Descendant (MLD). The MLD shall complete the inspection of the site within 48 hours of receiving permission from the landowner to inspect the site, and shall discuss and confer with the landowner over reasonable options for treatment.	Less than significant
4.5 Geology and Soils				
Unstable Soils	Implementation of the proposed project would have a potentially significant impact associated with unstable soils because the proposed project site contains existing soil units that are not suitable for use as support fill or structures.	***Geo-1***	After site clearing and grubbing has been completed, all fill material, topsoil, subsoil, and younger alluvial deposits shall be removed in the areas to be graded or that will support settlement-sensitive improvements, in compliance with the CBC. In the areas where structures and streets are proposed, the younger alluvium shall be removed to the granitic bedrock, older alluvium, or at least two feet above the groundwater table, whichever is less. In areas that will be paved for parking or driveway access, material removal shall extend to a depth of four feet below subgrade.	Less than significant
		Geo-2	Prior to placing any new fill soils or constructing any new improvements in areas that have been cleaned out to receive fill, the exposed soils should be scarified to a depth of 12 inches, moisture conditioned, and compacted to at least 90 percent relative compaction, in compliance with the CBC. In areas supporting fill slopes, keys should be cut into the competent supporting materials. The keys should be at least twelve feet wide and be sloped back into the hillside at least two percent.	
4.7 Hazards and Hazardous Materials				
Airport Hazards	Operation of the proposed project would not result in a significant safety hazard for people working in the area due to proximity to the Gillespie Field Airport. However, construction of the proposed project would have the potential to result in a hazard to aircraft operations. This is considered to be a potentially significant impact.	***Haz-1***	At least two weeks prior to the start of construction-related activities on the project site, and on a bi-weekly basis throughout the construction period, the construction contactor shall coordinate with the Gillespie Field Airport Manager to ensure that appropriate actions are taken so that construction activities at the project site do not pose a hazard to air navigation. Such actions may include the issuance of a Notice to Airmen (NOTAM) with sufficient lead time to notify pilots of potentially hazardous flight conditions at or around the proposed project site.	Less than significant
4.10 Noise				
Exposure to Permanent Increase in Ambient Noise	Impacts from transportation noise, including traffic and trolley noise, would result in less than significant impacts on the proposed project and surrounding uses. Impacts from project-generated operational noise to off-site residences are considered potentially significant.	***Noi-1***	Noise from HVAC equipment shall be reduced by either the installation of acoustical shielding around all new rooftop HVAC equipment (which would reduce noise by up to 15 dBA), or by placing the HVAC equipment below grade in basement space. The acoustical shielding shall include a parapet wall of sufficient height to fully shield the equipment or acoustical shielding which complements the proposed building elevations and also fully shields the equipment.	Less than significant

Issue Area	Significant Impact(s)	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance of Impact(s) After Mitigation*
Temporary Increase in Ambient Noise	Temporary noise impacts from construction equipment at nearby residences are considered potentially significant.	***Noi-2*** The project applicant shall implement the following measures to minimize short-term noise levels caused by construction activities. Measures to reduce construction/demolition noise to the maximum extent feasible shall be included in contractor specifications and shall include, but not be limited to, the following: • Construction equipment shall be properly outfitted and maintained with manufacturer-recommended noise-reduction devices to minimize construction-generated noise. • Stationary construction noise sources such as generators or pumps shall be located at least 100 feet from noise-sensitive land uses, to the extent feasible. • Lay-down and construction vehicle staging areas shall be located as far from noise-sensitive land uses as feasible. • Construction activity shall be restricted to occur between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. Monday through Friday, excluding holidays, and 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. on Saturday.	Less than significant
4.12 Traffic			
Increases in Traffic and Exceedance of LOS Standards	Implementation of the proposed project would result in direct and cumulative significant impacts to roadway intersections in the project area due to an unacceptable LOS E or F. The proposed project would result in direct impacts to the Weld Boulevard/Gillespie Way/Project driveway intersection and cumulative impacts to the Fanita Drive/Grossmont College Drive intersection.	***Tra-1*** Prior to operation of Phase 1 of the proposed project, the project applicant shall contribute a fair share towards the future signalization of the Fanita Drive/Grossmont College Drive intersection into a fund set up specifically for the improvement of this intersection. The project contributes 35 trips at this intersection which has a total trip count of 1,189 trips during the PM peak hour. Therefore, the project's fair share percentage is 3 percent. The fair share amount will be $6,000 assuming that the cost of installing the signal is approximately $200,000. ***Tra-2*** Prior to operation of Phase 2 of the proposed project, the project applicant shall install a traffic signal at the Weld Boulevard/Gillespie Way intersection and implement the following lane configuration. • Southbound – two left-turn lanes with storage of 125 feet and one shared 20-foot wide through/right-turn lane. • Northbound – one left-turn lane and one shared through/right-turn lane. • Eastbound – one left-turn lane, one through lane, and one shared through/right-turn lane. • Westbound – one left-turn lane, one thru lane, and one shared 20-foot wide through/right-turn lane. ***Tra-3*** A certificate of occupancy permit shall not be issued for any phase of the proposed project until the extension of SR-52 from SR-125 to SR-67 has been completed and is operational.	Less than significant

Table S-2. Summary Comparison of Project Alternatives to the Project

Description of Alternative	Advantages	Disadvantages
No Project Alternative		
Under the No Project Alternative, it is assumed that no additional development would occur on the project site. The site would remain in its present state and the proposed project would not be implemented. Although the project site is designated as Open Space, Public Institution and Special Designation Area 1 (SDA-1) in the El Cajon General Plan, the No Project Alternative assumes that the project site would not be developed with General Plan compatible uses.	• Significant unavoidable temporary air quality impacts from NO_x during simultaneous project construction of Phase 3 and operation of Phases 1 and 2 would be avoided. • Significant mitigable impacts to disturbed Diegan coastal sage scrub and non-native grassland habitat would be avoided. • Significant mitigable impacts to approximately 250 stems of San Diego ambrosia that occur within the project site would be avoided. • Significant mitigable impacts to raptor foraging habitat and raptor nesting habitat would be avoided. • Significant mitigable impacts to federal and State jurisdictional areas would be avoided. • Potentially significant mitigable indirect impacts from construction noise to local wildlife in areas where raptors are nesting would be avoided. • Potential mitigable impacts to buried human remains would be avoided. • Potential mitigable safety hazards to airport operations due to construction activities in close proximity to the Gillespie Field Airport would be avoided. • Significant mitigable noise impacts from construction equipment at nearby residences would be avoided. • Significant mitigable impacts from project-generated operational noise associated with the operation of HVAC equipment and truck deliveries to off-site residences would be avoided. • Significant mitigable impacts to unstable soils associated with new construction or ground disturbance would be avoided. • Significant mitigable direct traffic impacts to the intersection of Weld Boulevard/Gillespie Way would be avoided. • Significant mitigable cumulative traffic impacts to the intersection of Fanita Drive/Grossmont College Drive would be avoided.	• This alternative would not fulfill any of the ten project objectives described in Section 3.0, Project Description. • Significant impacts to biological resources would have the potential to occur from ongoing maintenance activities that would not require discretionary approval, such as brush clearing, mowing or tilling. • This alternative would not provide land uses compatible with the SDA-1 land use designation of the site as identified in the City's General Plan. • This alternative may result in significant impacts to water quality because the project site does not currently employ any best management practices to reduce pollutants in site runoff. The majority of the project site is vacant land and contains exposed soils, which can contribute to sedimentation in downstream receiving waters.

Description of Alternative	Advantages	Disadvantages
Reduced Footprint Alternative		
Under the Reduced Footprint Alternative, the industrial park would be constructed on the portion of the project site that is designated as SDA-1 in the City of El Cajon General Plan. The northern portion of the proposed project site, which is designated as Open Space in the General Plan, would not be included in the footprint for this alternative and would remain in its current state. In addition, the small portion of the proposed project site that is designated Public Institution would not be included in the footprint for this alternative. Approximately three of the four proposed industrial buildings could be constructed under the Reduced Footprint Alternative. The industrial park buildings would be altered from the proposed project site plan in order to maximize the developable area within the reduced footprint area.	• Significant unavoidable temporary air quality impacts from NO_x during simultaneous project construction of Phase 3 and operation of Phases 1 and 2 would be reduced and/or avoided. • Significant mitigable impacts to disturbed Diegan coastal sage scrub and non-native grassland habitat would be reduced as compared to the proposed project. • Significant mitigable impacts to raptor foraging habitat including non-native grassland and raptor nesting habitat including eucalyptus woodland would be reduced as compared to the proposed project. • Significant mitigable impacts to federal and State jurisdictional areas would be reduced as compared to the proposed project. • This alternative would not require a General Plan Amendment, since industrial uses are allowable in SDA-1. A site rezone from Open Space to Manufacturing would still be required. • This alternative would reduce significant noise impacts associated with project operation, including the operation of HVAC equipment, on adjacent residences due to the increased distance of the residences to the reduced project footprint. In particular, noise impacts to the residence north of the project site would be reduced as compared to the proposed project. • This alternative would lessen the impacts to traffic due to the reduced area of development. The generation of additional traffic on local roadways would be reduced and would generate fewer trips than the proposed project. • Significant mitigable cumulative traffic impacts to the intersection of Fanita Drive/Grossmont College Drive would be reduced as compared to the proposed project.	• This alternative would not fulfill four of the ten project objectives including: 1) create three new parcels on the 31.5-acre project site that coincide with Phases 1 to 3; 2) construct industrial buildings on each of the parcels; 3) change the General Plan land use designation of the site to Industrial Park (IP); and 4) provide approximately 463,000 square feet (SF) of new industrial space. • This alternative would not maximize the use of the project site for industrial uses, which would help to offset the loss of planned industrial uses in other areas of the Gillespie Field Airport property, such as the 70-acre Brucker Leasehold. • Similar to the proposed project the following significant mitigable impacts would occur under this alternative: - Impacts to approximately 250 stems of San Diego ambrosia; - Indirect noise impacts to raptors during project construction; - Impacts to buried human remains; - Safety hazards to airport operations from project construction activities; - Temporary noise impacts from construction equipment at nearby residences; - Impacts to unstable soils associated with new construction or ground disturbance; and - Direct traffic impacts to the intersection of Weld Boulevard/Gillespie Way.