



THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO

## MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Project No. PRJ-0698915

SCH No. NA

**SUBJECT:**     **2072 Via Casa Alta:** The project proposes a Coastal Development Permit (CDP), Site Development Permit (SDP), and a Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA) Boundary Line Adjustment (BLA) for a new 16,251-square-foot (sf) 2-story single dwelling unit over basement, accessory structure, pool, and associated site improvements (i.e. hardscape and landscaping) on a vacant lot located at 2072 Via Casa Alta. The 0.77-acre site contains Environmentally Sensitive Lands (ESL) for sensitive biological resources and steep slopes, is located in the RS-1-1 Zone and Coastal Overlay (Non-Appealable) Zone and is designed Very Low Density Residential (0-5 DU/AC) and Parks, Open Space within the La Jolla Community Plan area. (LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Lot 15 of La Jolla Scenic West, Map No. 8482.)  
APPLICANT: Claude-Anthony Marengo

I.     PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

See attached Initial Study.

II.    ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING:

See attached Initial Study.

III.   DETERMINATION:

The City of San Diego conducted an Initial Study which determined that the proposed project could have a significant environmental effect in the following area(s): **Biological Resources, Cultural Resources (Archaeology), Tribal Cultural Resources**. Subsequent revisions in the project proposal create the specific mitigation identified in Section V of this Mitigated Negative Declaration. The project as revised now avoids or mitigates the potentially significant environmental effects previously identified, and the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report will not be required.

IV.   DOCUMENTATION:

The attached Initial Study documents the reasons to support the above Determination.

V. MITIGATION, MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM:

**A. GENERAL REQUIREMENTS – PART I Plan Check Phase (prior to permit issuance)**

1. Prior to the issuance of any construction permits, such as demolition, grading or building, or beginning any construction-related activity on-site, the Development Services Department (DSD) Director's Environmental Designee (ED) shall review and approve construction documents (CD) (plans, specification, details, etc.) to ensure the applicable MMRP requirements are incorporated into the design and/or construction documents.
2. In addition, the ED shall verify that the MMRP Conditions/Notes that apply ONLY to the construction phases of this project are included VERBATIM under the heading, **"ENVIRONMENTAL/MITIGATION REQUIREMENTS."**
3. These notes must be shown within the first three (3) sheets of the construction documents in the format specified for engineering construction document templates as shown on the City of San Diego (City) website:  
<https://www.sandiego.gov/development-services/forms-publications/design-guidelines-templates>
4. The **TITLE INDEX SHEET** must also show on which pages the "Environmental/Mitigation Requirements" notes are provided.
5. **SURETY AND COST RECOVERY:** The DSD Director or City Manager may require appropriate surety instruments or bonds from private Permit Holders to ensure the long-term performance or implementation of required mitigation measures or programs. The City is authorized to recover its cost to offset the salary, overhead, and expenses for City personnel and programs to monitor qualifying projects.

**B. GENERAL REQUIREMENTS – PART II Post Plan Check (After permit issuance/Prior to start of construction)**

1. **PRE-CONSTRUCTION MEETING IS REQUIRED TEN (10) WORKING DAYS PRIOR TO BEGINNING ANY WORK ON THIS PROJECT.** The PERMIT HOLDER/OWNER is responsible to arrange and perform this meeting by contacting the CITY RESIDENT ENGINEER (RE) of the Field Engineering Division and City staff from MITIGATION MONITORING COORDINATION (MMC). Attendees must also include the Permit holder's Representative(s), Job Site Superintendent, and the following consultants:

***Qualified Biologist***  
***Qualified Archaeologist***  
***Qualified Native American Monitor***

**Note: If all responsible Permit Holders' representatives and consultants fail to attend, an additional meeting with all parties present will be required.**

CONTACT INFORMATION:

- a) **The PRIMARY POINT OF CONTACT is the RE at the Field Engineering Division and can be reached at (858) 627-3200**
- b) **For Clarification of ENVIRONMENTAL REQUIREMENTS, contact call RE and MMC at (858) 627-3360**

2. **MMRP COMPLIANCE:** This Project, PRJ-0698915 and /or Environmental Document 0698915 shall conform to the mitigation requirements contained in the associated Environmental Document and implemented to the satisfaction of the DSD's Environmental Designee (MMC) and the City Engineer (RE). The requirements may not be reduced or changed but may be annotated (i.e., to explain when and how compliance is being met and the location of verifying proof, etc.). Additional clarifying information may also be added to other relevant plan sheets and/or specifications as appropriate (i.e., specific locations, monitoring times, methodology, etc.)

**Note: The Permit Holder's Representatives must alert RE and MMC if there are any discrepancies in the plans, notes, or changes due to field conditions. All conflicts must be approved by RE and MMC BEFORE the work is performed.**

3. **OTHER AGENCY REQUIREMENTS:** Evidence of compliance with all other agency requirements or permits shall be submitted to the RE and MMC for review and acceptance prior to the beginning of work or within one week of the Permit Holder obtaining documentation of those permits or requirements. Evidence shall include copies of permits, letters of resolution, or other documentation issued by the responsible agency.

***None Applicable***

4. **MONITORING EXHIBITS:** All consultants are required to submit to RE and MMC, a monitoring exhibit on an 11x17 reduction of the appropriate construction plan, such as site plan, grading, landscape, etc., marked to clearly show the specific areas including the **LIMIT OF WORK**, scope of that discipline's work, and notes indicating when in the construction schedule that work will be performed. When necessary for clarification, a detailed methodology of how the work will be performed shall be included.

**Note: Surety and Cost Recovery: When deemed necessary by the DSD Director or City Manager, additional surety instruments or bonds from the private Permit Holder may be required to ensure the long-term performance or implementation of required mitigation measures or programs. The City is authorized to recover its cost to offset the salary, overhead, and expenses for City personnel and programs to monitor qualifying projects.**

5. **OTHER SUBMITTALS AND INSPECTIONS:** The Permit Holder/Owner's representative shall submit all required documentation, verification letters, and requests for all associated inspections to the RE and MMC for approval per the following schedule:

Document Submittal/Inspection Checklist		
Issue Area	Document Submittal	Associated Inspection/Approvals/Notes
General	Consultant Qualification Letters	Prior to the Preconstruction Meeting
General	Consultant Construction Monitoring Exhibits	Prior to or at the Preconstruction Meeting
Land Use	Land Use Adjacency Issues CVSRs	Land Use Adjacency Issue Site Observations
Biology	Biologist Limit of Work Verification	Limit of Work Inspection
Archaeology	Monitoring Reports	Archaeology/Historic Site Observation
Tribal Cultural Resources	Monitoring Reports	Archaeology/Historic Site Observation
Bond Release	Request for Bond Release Letter	Final MMRP Inspections Prior to Bond Release Letter

**C. SPECIFIC MMRP ISSUE AREA CONDITIONS/REQUIREMENTS**

**BIO-1 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES (RESOURCE PROTECTIONS DURING CONSTRUCTION)**

**I. Prior to Construction**

- A. **Biologist Verification:** The owner/permittee shall provide a letter to the City's Mitigation Monitoring Coordination (MMC) section stating that a Project Biologist (Qualified Biologist) as defined in the City of San Diego's Biological Guidelines (2018), has been retained to implement the project's biological monitoring program. The letter shall include the names and contact information of all persons involved in the biological monitoring of the project.
- B. **Preconstruction Meeting:** The Qualified Biologist shall attend the preconstruction meeting, discuss the project's biological monitoring program, and arrange to perform any follow up mitigation measures and reporting including site-specific monitoring, restoration or revegetation, and additional fauna/flora surveys/salvage.
- C. **Biological Documents:** The Qualified Biologist shall submit all required documentation to MMC verifying that any special mitigation reports including but not limited to, maps, plans,

surveys, survey timelines, or buffers are completed or scheduled per City Biology Guidelines, Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP), Environmentally Sensitive Lands Ordinance (ESL), project permit conditions; California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA); endangered species acts (ESAs); and/or other local, state or federal requirements.

- D. **BCME:** The Qualified Biologist shall present a Biological Construction Mitigation/Monitoring Exhibit (BCME) which includes the biological documents in C above. In addition, include: restoration/revegetation plans, plant salvage/relocation requirements (e.g., coastal cactus wren plant salvage, burrowing owl exclusions, etc.), avian or other wildlife surveys/survey schedules (including general avian nesting and USFWS protocol), timing of surveys, wetland buffers, avian construction avoidance areas/noise buffers/ barriers, other impact avoidance areas, and any subsequent requirements determined by the Qualified Biologist and the City ADD/MMC. The BCME shall include a site plan, written and graphic depiction of the project's biological mitigation/monitoring program, and a schedule. The BCME shall be approved by MMC and referenced in the construction documents.
- E. **Resource Delineation:** Prior to construction activities, the Qualified Biologist shall supervise the placement of orange construction fencing or equivalent along the limits of disturbance adjacent to sensitive biological habitats and verify compliance with any other project conditions as shown on the BCME. This phase shall include flagging plant specimens and delimiting buffers to protect sensitive biological resources (e.g., habitats/flora & fauna species, including nesting birds) during construction. Appropriate steps/care should be taken to minimize attraction of nest predators to the site.
- F. **Education:** Prior to commencement of construction activities, the Qualified Biologist shall meet with the owner/permittee or designee and the construction crew and conduct an on-site educational session regarding the need to avoid impacts outside of the approved construction area and to protect sensitive flora and fauna (e.g., explain the avian and wetland buffers, flag system for removal of invasive species or retention of sensitive plants, and clarify acceptable access routes/methods and staging areas, etc.).

## II. During Construction

- A. **Monitoring:** All construction (including access/staging areas) shall be restricted to areas previously identified, proposed for development/staging, or previously disturbed as shown on "Exhibit A" and/or the BCME. The Qualified Biologist shall monitor construction activities as needed to ensure that construction activities do not encroach into biologically sensitive areas, or cause other similar damage, and that the work plan has been amended to accommodate any sensitive species located during the pre-construction surveys. In addition, the Qualified Biologist shall document field activity via the Consultant Site Visit Record (CSV). The CSV shall be e-mailed to MMC on the 1<sup>st</sup> day of monitoring, the 1<sup>st</sup> week of each month, the last day of monitoring, and immediately in the case of any undocumented condition or discovery.

- B. **Subsequent Resource Identification:** The Qualified Biologist shall note/act to prevent any new disturbances to habitat, flora, and/or fauna onsite (e.g., flag plant specimens for avoidance during access, etc). If active nests or other previously unknown sensitive resources are detected, all project activities that directly impact the resource shall be delayed until species specific local, state or federal regulations have been determined and applied by the Qualified Biologist.

### **III. Post Construction Measures**

- A. In the event that impacts exceed previously allowed amounts, additional impacts shall be mitigated in accordance with City Biology Guidelines, ESL and MSCP, State CEQA, and other applicable local, state and federal law. The Qualified Biologist shall submit a final BCME/report to the satisfaction of the City ADD/MMC within 30 days of construction completion.

#### **BIO-2 Biological Resources (Habitat Acquisition Fund)**

Prior to the issuance of any construction permits, such as demolition, grading or building, or beginning any construction-related activity on-site, the owner/permittee shall make a monetary payment to the City of San Diego's Habitat Acquisition Fund (HAF) to mitigate the loss of 0.03-acre of native grassland (Tier I). The HAF fee is based on mitigation ratios outlined in the City of San Diego Biology Guidelines; thereby, the owner/permittee shall mitigate the loss of 0.03 acres at a 1:1 ratio inside of the Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA). Therefore, the resulting total mitigation obligation for direct project impacts would be 0.03 acres inside the MHPA equivalent monetary contribution to the City's HAF plus a 10% administrative fee.

#### **BIO-3 Biological Resources (On-Site Preservation)**

Prior to Notice to Proceed (NTP) for any construction permits, including but not limited to, the first Grading Permit, Demolition Plans/Permits and Building Plans/Permits, the owner/permittee shall mitigate upland impacts in accordance with the City of San Diego Biology Guidelines. The project shall mitigate for direct impacts to upland vegetation communities through on-site preservation as follows: Impacts to 0.3 acres of Tier IIIB Non-Native Grassland shall be mitigated at a 0.5:1 ratio and impacts to 0.07 acres of Tier II Coastal Sage Scrub/Chapparal shall be mitigated at a 1:1 ratio within the MHPA through on-site preservation of 0.22 acres of Tier II Coastal Sage Scrub/Chapparal. The on-site mitigation, which is in the MHPA, and all remaining onsite MHPA after the MHPA BLA shall be protected from future development by recording a Covenant of Easement over it. Long-term management of the land shall be the responsibility of, and provided by, the property owner.

#### **BIO-4 Long-Term Management of Biological Resources (On-Site Preservation)**

Prior to the issuance of any construction permits, including but not limited to, the first Grading Permit, Demolition Plans/Permits and Building Plans/Permits, the owner/permittee shall submit a Long-Term Habitat Management Plan which identifies the managing entity and includes the Property Analysis Record (PAR) or equivalent to ensure adequate funding for the long-term management and monitoring of the mitigation site and MHPA. The Mitigation Program must include documentation on how the project would implement the objectives of the MSCP Preserve Management and the area specific management directives. The Mitigation Program must identify the responsible entity for long-term maintenance and management, the requirements for future management and monitoring reports, and a secure funding source to pay for the management in perpetuity.

## **HISTORICAL RESOURCES (ARCHAEOLOGY)**

### **I. Prior to Permit Issuance**

#### **A. Entitlements Plan Check**

1. Prior to issuance of any construction permits, including but not limited to, the first Grading Permit, Demolition Plans/Permits and Building Plans/Permits or a Notice to Proceed for Subdivisions, but prior to the first preconstruction meeting, whichever is applicable, the Assistant Deputy Director (ADD) Environmental designee shall verify that the requirements for Archaeological Monitoring and Native American monitoring have been noted on the applicable construction documents through the plan check process.

#### **B. Letters of Qualification have been submitted to ADD**

1. The applicant shall submit a letter of verification to Mitigation Monitoring Coordination (MMC) identifying the Principal Investigator (PI) for the project and the names of all persons involved in the archaeological monitoring program, as defined in the City of San Diego Historical Resources Guidelines (HRG). If applicable, individuals involved in the archaeological monitoring program must have completed the 40-hour HAZWOPER training with certification documentation.
2. MMC will provide a letter to the applicant confirming the qualifications of the PI and all persons involved in the archaeological monitoring of the project meet the qualifications established in the HRG.
3. Prior to the start of work, the applicant must obtain written approval from MMC for any personnel changes associated with the monitoring program.

### **II. Prior to Start of Construction**

#### **A. Verification of Records Search**

1. The PI shall provide verification to MMC that a site-specific records search (1/4 mile radius) has been completed. Verification includes, but is not limited to a copy of a confirmation letter from South Coastal Information Center, or, if the search was in-house, a letter of verification from the PI stating that the search was completed.
2. The letter shall introduce any pertinent information concerning expectations and probabilities of discovery during trenching and/or grading activities.
3. The PI may submit a detailed letter to MMC requesting a reduction to the ¼ mile radius.

B. PI Shall Attend Precon Meetings

1. Prior to beginning any work that requires monitoring; the Applicant shall arrange a Precon Meeting that shall include the PI, Native American consultant/monitor (where Native American resources may be impacted), Construction Manager (CM) and/or Grading Contractor, Resident Engineer (RE), Building Inspector (BI), if appropriate, and MMC. The qualified Archaeologist and Native American Monitor shall attend any grading/excavation related Precon Meetings to make comments and/or suggestions concerning the Archaeological Monitoring program with the Construction Manager and/or Grading Contractor.
  - a. If the PI is unable to attend the Precon Meeting, the Applicant shall schedule a focused Precon Meeting with MMC, the PI, RE, CM or BI, if appropriate, prior to the start of any work that requires monitoring.
2. Identify Areas to be Monitored
  - a. Prior to the start of any work that requires monitoring, the PI shall submit an Archaeological Monitoring Exhibit (AME) (with verification that the AME has been reviewed and approved by the Native American consultant/monitor when Native American resources may be impacted) based on the appropriate construction documents (reduced to 11x17) to MMC identifying the areas to be monitored including the delineation of grading/excavation limits.
  - b. The AME shall be based on the results of a site-specific records search as well as information regarding existing known soil conditions (native or formation).
3. When Monitoring Will Occur
  - a. Prior to the start of any work, the PI shall also submit a construction schedule to MMC through the RE indicating when and where monitoring will occur.
  - b. The PI may submit a detailed letter to MMC prior to the start of work or during construction requesting a modification to the monitoring program. This request shall be based on relevant information such as review of final construction



documents which indicate site conditions such as depth of excavation and/or site graded to bedrock, etc., which may reduce or increase the potential for resources to be present.

### **III. During Construction**

#### **A. Monitor(s) Shall be Present During Grading/Excavation/Trenching**

1. The Archaeological Monitor shall be present full-time during all soil disturbing and grading/excavation/trenching activities which could result in impacts to archaeological resources as identified on the AME. The Construction Manager is responsible for notifying the RE, PI, and MMC of changes to any construction activities such as in the case of a potential safety concern within the area being monitored. In certain circumstances OSHA safety requirements may necessitate modification of the AME.
2. The Native American consultant/monitor shall determine the extent of their presence during soil disturbing and grading/excavation/trenching activities based on the AME and provide that information to the PI and MMC. If prehistoric resources are encountered during the Native American consultant/monitor's absence, work shall stop and the Discovery Notification Process detailed in Section III.B-C and IV.A-D shall commence.
3. The PI may submit a detailed letter to MMC during construction requesting a modification to the monitoring program when a field condition such as modern disturbance post-dating the previous grading/trenching activities, presence of fossil formations, or when native soils are encountered that may reduce or increase the potential for resources to be present.
4. The archaeological and Native American consultant/monitor shall document field activity via the Consultant Site Visit Record (CSVr). The CSVr's shall be faxed or emailed by the CM to the RE the first day of monitoring, the last day of monitoring, monthly (Notification of Monitoring Completion), and in the case of ANY discoveries. The RE shall forward copies to MMC.

#### **B. Discovery Notification Process**

1. In the event of a discovery, the Archaeological Monitor shall direct the contractor to temporarily divert all soil disturbing activities, including but not limited to digging, trenching, excavating or grading activities in the area of discovery and in the area reasonably suspected to overlay adjacent resources and immediately notify the RE or BI, as appropriate.

2. The Monitor shall immediately notify the PI (unless Monitor is the PI) of the discovery.
3. The PI shall immediately notify MMC by phone of the discovery, and shall also submit written documentation to MMC within 24 hours by fax or email with photos of the resource in context, if possible.
4. No soil shall be exported off-site until a determination can be made regarding the significance of the resource specifically if Native American resources are encountered.

C. Determination of Significance

1. The PI and Native American consultant/monitor, where Native American resources are discovered shall evaluate the significance of the resource. If Human Remains are involved, follow protocol in Section IV below.
  - a. The PI shall immediately notify MMC by phone to discuss significance determination and shall also submit a letter to MMC indicating whether additional mitigation is required.
  - b. If the resource is significant, the PI shall submit an Archaeological Data Recovery Program (ADRP) which has been reviewed by the Native American consultant/monitor, and obtain written approval from MMC. Impacts to significant resources must be mitigated before ground disturbing activities in the area of discovery will be allowed to resume. Note: If a unique archaeological site is also an historical resource as defined in Guidelines Section, then the limits on the amount(s) that a project applicant may be required to pay to cover mitigation costs as indicated in CEQA Section 21083.2 shall not apply.
  - c. If the resource is not significant, the PI shall submit a letter to MMC indicating that artifacts will be collected, curated, and documented in the Final Monitoring Report. The letter shall also indicate that that no further work is required.

**IV. Discovery of Human Remains**

If human remains are discovered, work shall halt in that area and no soil shall be exported off-site until a determination can be made regarding the provenance of the human remains; and the following procedures as set forth in CEQA Section 15064.5(e), the California Public Resources Code (Sec. 5097.98) and State Health and Safety Code (Sec. 7050.5) shall be undertaken:

A. Notification

1. Archaeological Monitor shall notify the RE or BI as appropriate, MMC, and the PI, if the Monitor is not qualified as a PI. MMC will notify the appropriate Senior Planner in the Environmental Analysis Section (EAS) of the Development Services Department to assist with the discovery notification process.
  2. The PI shall notify the Medical Examiner after consultation with the RE, either in person or via telephone.
- B. Isolate discovery site
1. Work shall be directed away from the location of the discovery and any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlay adjacent human remains until a determination can be made by the Medical Examiner in consultation with the PI concerning the provenance of the remains.
  2. The Medical Examiner, in consultation with the PI, will determine the need for a field examination to determine the provenance.
  3. If a field examination is not warranted, the Medical Examiner will determine with input from the PI, if the remains are or are most likely to be of Native American origin.
- C. If Human Remains ARE determined to be Native American
1. The Medical Examiner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) within 24 hours. By law, ONLY the Medical Examiner can make this call.
  2. NAHC will immediately identify the person or persons determined to be the Most Likely Descendent (MLD) and provide contact information.
  3. The MLD will contact the PI within 24 hours or sooner after the Medical Examiner has completed coordination, to begin the consultation process in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(e), the California Public Resources and Health & Safety Codes.
  4. The MLD will have 48 hours to make recommendations to the property owner or representative, for the treatment or disposition with proper dignity, of the human remains and associated grave goods.
  5. Disposition of Native American Human Remains will be determined between the MLD and the PI, and, if:
    - a. The NAHC is unable to identify the MLD, OR the MLD failed to make a recommendation within 48 hours after being granted access to the site, OR;

- b. The landowner or authorized representative rejects the recommendation of the MLD and mediation in accordance with PRC 5097.94 (k) by the NAHC fails to provide measures acceptable to the landowner, the landowner shall reinter the human remains and items associated with Native American human remains with appropriate dignity on the property in a location not subject to further and future subsurface disturbance, THEN
- c. To protect these sites, the landowner shall do one or more of the following:
  - (1) Record the site with the NAHC;
  - (2) Record an open space or conservation easement; or
  - (3) Record a document with the County. The document shall be titled "Notice of Reinterment of Native American Remains" and shall include a legal description of the property, the name of the property owner, and the owner's acknowledged signature, in addition to any other information required by PRC 5097.98. The document shall be indexed as a notice under the name of the owner.

## **V. Night and/or Weekend Work**

- A. If night and/or weekend work is included in the contract
  - 1. When night and/or weekend work is included in the contract package, the extent and timing shall be presented and discussed at the precon meeting.
  - 2. The following procedures shall be followed.
    - a. No Discoveries

In the event that no discoveries were encountered during night and/or weekend work, the PI shall record the information on the CSV and submit to MMC via fax by 8AM of the next business day.
    - b. Discoveries

All discoveries shall be processed and documented using the existing procedures detailed in Sections III - During Construction, and IV - Discovery of Human Remains. Discovery of human remains shall always be treated as a significant discovery.
    - c. Potentially Significant Discoveries

If the PI determines that a potentially significant discovery has been made, the procedures detailed under Section III - During Construction and IV-Discovery of Human Remains shall be followed.

- d. The PI shall immediately contact MMC, or by 8AM of the next business day to report and discuss the findings as indicated in Section III-B, unless other specific arrangements have been made.
- B. If night and/or weekend work becomes necessary during the course of construction
  - 1. The Construction Manager shall notify the RE, or BI, as appropriate, a minimum of 24 hours before the work is to begin.
  - 2. The RE, or BI, as appropriate, shall notify MMC immediately.
- C. All other procedures described above shall apply, as appropriate.

## **VI. Post Construction**

- A. Preparation and Submittal of Draft Monitoring Report
  - 1. The PI shall submit two copies of the Draft Monitoring Report (even if negative), prepared in accordance with the Historical Resources Guidelines (Appendix C/D) which describes the results, analysis, and conclusions of all phases of the Archaeological Monitoring Program (with appropriate graphics) to MMC for review and approval within 90 days following the completion of monitoring. It should be noted that if the PI is unable to submit the Draft Monitoring Report within the allotted 90-day timeframe resulting from delays with analysis, special study results or other complex issues, a schedule shall be submitted to MMC establishing agreed due dates and the provision for submittal of monthly status reports until this measure can be met.
    - a. For significant archaeological resources encountered during monitoring, the Archaeological Data Recovery Program shall be included in the Draft Monitoring Report.
    - b. Recording Sites with State of California Department of Parks and Recreation

The PI shall be responsible for recording (on the appropriate State of California Department of Park and Recreation forms-DPR 523 A/B) any significant or potentially significant resources encountered during the Archaeological Monitoring Program in accordance with the City's Historical Resources

Guidelines, and submittal of such forms to the South Coastal Information Center with the Final Monitoring Report.

2. MMC shall return the Draft Monitoring Report to the PI for revision or, for preparation of the Final Report.
3. The PI shall submit revised Draft Monitoring Report to MMC for approval.
4. MMC shall provide written verification to the PI of the approved report.
5. MMC shall notify the RE or BI, as appropriate, of receipt of all Draft Monitoring Report submittals and approvals.

B. Handling of Artifacts

1. The PI shall be responsible for ensuring that all cultural remains collected are cleaned and catalogued
2. The PI shall be responsible for ensuring that all artifacts are analyzed to identify function and chronology as they relate to the history of the area; that faunal material is identified as to species; and that specialty studies are completed, as appropriate.
3. The cost for curation is the responsibility of the property owner.

C. Curation of artifacts: Accession Agreement and Acceptance Verification

1. The PI shall be responsible for ensuring that all artifacts associated with the survey, testing and/or data recovery for this project are permanently curated with an appropriate institution. This shall be completed in consultation with MMC and the Native American representative, as applicable.
2. The PI shall include the Acceptance Verification from the curation institution in the Final Monitoring Report submitted to the RE or BI and MMC.
3. When applicable to the situation, the PI shall include written verification from the Native American consultant/monitor indicating that Native American resources were treated in accordance with state law and/or applicable agreements. If the resources were reinterred, verification shall be provided to show what protective measures were taken to ensure no further disturbance occurs in accordance with Section IV – Discovery of Human Remains, Subsection 5.

D. Final Monitoring Report(s)

1. The PI shall submit one copy of the approved Final Monitoring Report to the RE or BI as appropriate, and one copy to MMC (even if negative), within 90 days after notification from MMC that the draft report has been approved.

2. The RE shall, in no case, issue the Notice of Completion and/or release of the Performance Bond for grading until receiving a copy of the approved Final Monitoring Report from MMC which includes the Acceptance Verification from the curation institution.

### **TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES**

Impacts to Tribal Cultural Resources would be reduced to below a level of significance with implementation of mitigation measures outlined under Historical Resources (Archaeology)

#### **VI. PUBLIC REVIEW DISTRIBUTION:**

Draft copies or notice of this Mitigated Negative Declaration were distributed to:

##### **FEDERAL**

U.S Fish & Wildlife Service (23)

##### **STATE**

California Department of Fish & Wildlife (32)

State Clearinghouse (46A)

##### **CITY OF SAN DIEGO**

Mayor's Office

Council member Joe LaCava, Council District 1

Development Services:

Development Project Manager

Engineering Review

Environmental Review

Planning Review

Geology Review

Landscaping Review

Planning Department :

MSCP, MS-SA

Fire Department

Fire-Plan Review

MMC (77A)

City Attorney's Office (93C)

La Jolla Library (81L)

##### **OTHER ORGANIZATIONS AND INTERESTED PARTIES**

Sierra Club (165)

San Diego Audubon Society (167)

Mr. Jim Peugh (167A)

California Native Plant Society (170)  
Endangered Habitats League (182A)  
Historical Resources Board (87)  
Carmen Lucas (206)  
South Coastal Information Center (210)  
San Diego Archaeological Center (212)  
Save Our Heritage Organization (214)  
Ron Christman (215)  
Clint Linton (215B)  
Frank Brown - Inter-Tribal Cultural Resources Council (216)  
Campo Band of Mission Indians (217)  
San Diego County Archaeological Society, Inc. (218)  
Kumeyaay Cultural Heritage Preservation (223)  
Kumeyaay Cultural Repatriation Committee (225)  
La Jolla Village News (271)  
La Jolla Town Council (273)  
La Jolla Historical Society (274)  
Jolla Community Planning (275)  
La Jolla Light (280)  
Patricia K. Miller (283)  
Harry Bubbins  
Richard Drury  
Molly Greene  
John Stump  
Philip Merten



VII. RESULTS OF PUBLIC REVIEW:

☐ No comments were received during the public input period.

☐ Comments were received but did not address the accuracy or completeness of the draft environmental document. No response is necessary and the letters are incorporated herein.

☐ Comments addressing the accuracy or completeness of the draft environmental document were received during the public input period. The letters and responses are incorporated herein.

Copies of the Mitigated Negative Declaration and associated project-specific technical appendices, if any, may be accessed on the City's CEQA webpage at <https://www.sandiego.gov/ceqa/final>.

  
Jeff Szymanski  
Senior Planner  
Development Services Department

March 26, 2025  
Date of Draft Report

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date of Final Report

Analyst: Marlene Watanabe

Attachments: Initial Study Checklist  
Figure 1: Location Map  
Figure 2: Site Plan

## INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

1. Project title/Project number: 2072 Via Casa Alta / PRJ-0698915
2. Lead agency name and address: City of San Diego, 1222 First Avenue, MS-501, San Diego, California 92101
3. Contact person and phone number: Marlene Watanabe / (619) 446-5129
4. Project location: 2072 Via Casa Alta, San Diego, CA 92037
5. Project Applicant/Sponsor's name and address: Claude-Anthony Marengo, Marengo Morton Architects, Inc., 7724 Girard Avenue, Second Floor, San Diego, CA 92037
6. General/Community Plan designation: Residential and Park, Open Space, and Recreation / Very Low Density Residential (0-5 DU/AC) and Parks, Open Space
7. Zoning: RS-1-1
8. Description of project (Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to, later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation.):

The project proposes a Coastal Development Permit (CDP) and Site Development Permit (SDP) for a new 16,251-square-foot (sf) 2-story single dwelling unit over basement and accessory structure, pool, and associated site improvements (i.e. hardscape and landscaping) on a vacant lot located at 2072 Via Casa Alta.

Per San Diego Municipal Code (SDMC) Section 143.0110(c)(1), the proposed development requires a SDP for the construction of a single dwelling unit with ESL in the form of sensitive biological resources and steep slopes on the site. The project does not propose any encroachment into steep hillsides. The project includes an approximately 0.364-acre COE, including overlapping areas of approximately 0.364 acres of Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA), approximately 0.354 acres of steep hillsides, and approximately 0.22 acres of sensitive habitat on-site mitigation area. The project also requires a CDP per SDMC Section 126.0704(a)(3) for new development/intensification on a vacant lot within the coastal zone.

The project proposes encroachment into the MHPA beyond the allowable development area pursuant to Sections 143.0142 and 131.0250(b) of the Land Development Code and pages 13-15 of the City's Biology Guidelines. As such, the project requires an MHPA boundary line adjustment.

The project's landscaping has been reviewed by staff and would comply with all applicable City of San Diego Landscape ordinances and standards. The project includes a Brush Management Program with SDMC Section 142.0412. Brush Management Zone One ranges

from 42-ft. to 54-ft. in width with a corresponding Zone Two of 35.5-ft. to 54.5-ft. in width, exercising Zone Two reduction options under §142.0412(f).

The proposed residence will capture all runoff from impervious areas by area drains, trench drains, and downspout and convey the storm water to a modular wetland biofiltration system with upstream detention. Drainage would be directed into appropriate storm drain systems designated to carry surface runoff. The Hydrology and Drainage Report (Labib Funk + Associates, 2025) has been reviewed and accepted by City Engineering staff.

The project earthwork would require 4,682 cubic yards of cut to a depth of 20.6 ft and 78 cubic yards of fill to a depth of 6 feet, requiring export of 4,604 cubic yards.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting:

The 0.77-acre site is located on west of the intersection of La Jolla Scenic S Drive and Via Casa Alta on a vacant parcel at 2072 Via Casa Alta. The site is located in the RS-1-1 Zone and Coastal Overlay (Non-Appealable) Zone and is designed Very Low Density Residential (0-5 DU/AC) and Parks, Open Space within the La Jolla Community Plan area. The site is currently vacant and is within a developed residential neighborhood surrounded by similar existing single-family residences.

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):

None required.

11. Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, has consultation begun?

In accordance with the requirements of Public Resources Code 21080.3.1, the City of San Diego provided formal notifications to the Lipay Nation of Santa Ysabel, the Jamul Indian Village, and the San Pasqual Band of Mission Indians which are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area; requesting consultation on August 6, 2024. No responses were received. Please see Section XVIII of the Initial Study for more detail.

Note: Conducting consultation early in the CEQA process allows tribal governments, lead agencies, and project proponents to discuss the level of environmental review, identify and address potential adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources, and reduce the potential for delay and conflict in the environmental review process. (See Public Resources Code section 21083.3.2.) Information may also be available from the California Native American Heritage Commission's Sacred Lands File per Public Resources Code section 5097.96 and the California Historical Resources Information System administered by the California Office of Historic Preservation. Please also note that Public Resources Code section 21082.3(c) contains provisions specific to confidentiality.

**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.

<input type="checkbox"/>	Aesthetics	<input type="checkbox"/>	Greenhouse Gas Emissions	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Services
<input type="checkbox"/>	Agriculture and Forestry Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	Hazards & Hazardous Materials	<input type="checkbox"/>	Recreation
<input type="checkbox"/>	Air Quality	<input type="checkbox"/>	Hydrology/Water Quality	<input type="checkbox"/>	Transportation
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Biological Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	Land Use/Planning	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Tribal Cultural Resources
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Cultural Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	Mineral Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	Utilities/Service System
<input type="checkbox"/>	Energy	<input type="checkbox"/>	Noise	<input type="checkbox"/>	Wildfire
<input type="checkbox"/>	Geology/Soils	<input type="checkbox"/>	Population/Housing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Mandatory Findings Significance

**DETERMINATION: (To be completed by Lead Agency)**

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

## EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis.)
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) “Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from “Earlier Analyses”, as described in (5) below, may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or (mitigated) negative declaration. *Section 15063(c)(3)(D)*. In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
  - a. Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
  - b. Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
  - c. Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “Less Than Significant With Mitigation Measures Incorporated”, describe the mitigation measures that were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
- 7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project’s environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
- 9) The explanation of each issue should identify:
  - a. The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
  - b. The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significant.

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS – Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Per the City of San Diego CEQA Significance Determination Thresholds (City's Thresholds) projects that would block public views from designated open space areas, roads, or parks or significant visual landmarks and scenic vistas may result in a significant impact.

The project is not located within any known view corridors per the La Jolla Community Plan. The project proposes to construct a single-family residence on a vacant site and is designed to comply with all setback and height requirements pursuant to the community plan and regulations in the Land Development Code. The project is located in a residential land use area with similar residential structures. The project would not block views of the Pacific Ocean because the site elevation and surrounding development obstructs any views of the ocean to the west of the site. The project would not have a substantial adverse effect on any scenic vistas. No Impact would result.

b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Refer to response I (a) above. The project is situated within a residential neighborhood with similar development. The site is not adjacent to a historic building and is not adjacent to a significant landmark. The project is not located within or adjacent to a state scenic highway and would be required to meet all design requirements pursuant to the La Jolla Community Plan. No impact would result.

c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

According to the City's Thresholds, projects that severely contrast with the surrounding neighborhood character may result in a significant impact. To meet this threshold one or more of the following conditions must apply: the project would have to exceed the allowable height or bulk regulations and the height or bulk of the existing patterns of development in the vicinity of the project by a substantial margin; have an architectural style or use building materials in stark contrast to adjacent development where the adjacent development follows a single or common architectural theme (e.g. Gaslamp Quarter, Old Town); result in the physical loss, isolation or degradation of a community identification symbol or landmark (e.g., a stand of trees, coastal bluff, historical landmark) which identified in the General Plan, applicable community plan or local coastal program;

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

be located in a highly visible area (e.g., on a canyon edge, hilltop or adjacent to an interstate highway) and would strongly contrast with the surrounding development or natural topography through excessive height, bulk signage or architectural projections; and/or the project would have a cumulative effect by opening up a new area for development or changing the overall character of the area. None of the above apply to the project.

The project was reviewed by DSD for consistency with design recommendations and policies as outlined in the La Jolla Community Plan. It was determined that this project would be consistent with the neighboring residences in bulk and scale and would be compatible with the neighborhood's diverse architectural styles. The neighborhood does not have a common or unifying architectural theme. This project would not adversely affect any ocean or scenic public view and the project would not result in a strong contrast with surrounding development or natural topography through excessive height, bulk, signage or architectural projections. Therefore, no impact would occur.

- |                                                                                                                       |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The project would comply with the outdoor lighting standards contained in SDMC Section 142.0740 (Outdoor Lighting Regulations) that requires all outdoor lighting be installed, shielded, and adjusted so that the light is directed in a manner that minimizes negative impacts from light pollution, including trespass, glare, and to control light from falling onto surrounding properties. Therefore, lighting installed with the project would not adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area, resulting in a less than significant lighting impact.

- II. AGRICULTURAL 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 Department 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::

- |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Converts 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The project is consistent with the La Jolla Community Plan land use designation Very Low Density Residential (0-5 DU/AC) and Parks, Open Space and is located within a developed residential neighborhood. As such, the project site does not contain, and is not adjacent to, any lands identified as Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as show on maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resource Agency. Therefore, the project would not result in the conversion of such lands to non-agricultural use. No significant impacts would occur, and no mitigation measures are required.

Issue	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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Refer to response II (a), above. There are no Williamson Act Contract lands on or within the vicinity of the project. The project is consistent with the existing land use and the underlying zone. The project would not conflict with any properties zoned for agricultural use or be affected by a Williamson Act Contract. No impacts would result.

c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 1220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The project would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production. No designated forest land or timberland occur onsite as the project is consistent with the community plan, and the underlying zone. No impacts would result.

d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Refer to response II (c) above. Additionally, the project would not contribute to the conversion of any forested land to non-forest use, as surrounding properties are developed, and land uses are generally built out. No impacts would result.

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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Refer to response II (a) and II (c), above. The project and surrounding areas do not contain any farmland or forest land. No changes to any such lands would result from project implementation. No impact would result.

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

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

According to the City's Thresholds, a project may have a significant air quality impact if it could conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan. The San Diego Air



Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

Pollution Control District (SDAPCD) and San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) are responsible for developing and implementing the clean air plan for attainment and maintenance of the ambient air quality standards in the San Diego Air Basin (SDAB). The County Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) was initially adopted in 1991 and is updated on a triennial basis (most recently in 2020). The RAQS outlines the SDAPCD's plans and control measures designed to attain the state air quality standards for ozone (O3). The RAQS relies on information from the California Air Resources Board (CARB) and SANDAG, including mobile and area source emissions, as well as information regarding projected growth in San Diego County and the cities in the county, to project future emissions and then determine the strategies necessary for the reduction of emissions through regulatory controls. CARB mobile source emission projections and SANDAG growth projections are based on population, vehicle trends, and land use plans developed by San Diego County and the cities in the county as part of the development of their general plans.

The RAQS relies on SANDAG growth projections based on population, vehicle trends, and land use plans developed by the cities and by the county as part of the development of their general plans. As such, projects that propose development that is consistent with the growth anticipated by local plans would be consistent with the RAQS. However, if a project proposes development that is greater than that anticipated in the local plan and SANDAG's growth projections, the project might be in conflict with the RAQS and may contribute to a potentially significant cumulative impact on air quality.

The project would be consistent with the General Plan, community plan, and the underlying zoning for single-family residential development. Therefore, the project would be consistent at a sub-regional level with the underlying growth forecasts in the RAQS and would not obstruct implementation of the RAQS or applicable air quality plan. As such, no impacts would result.

- b) 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?

☐
☐
☒
☐

The City's Thresholds state that a significant impact may occur if a project violates any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.

### ***Short-Term (Construction) Emissions.***

Construction-related activities are temporary, short-term sources of air emissions. Sources of construction-related air emissions include fugitive dust from grading activities.

Variables that factor into the total construction emissions potentially generated include the level of activity, length of construction period, number of pieces and types of equipment in use, site characteristics, weather conditions, number of construction personnel, and the amount of materials to be transported on or offsite.

Fugitive dust emissions are generally associated with land-clearing and grading operations. Construction operations would include standard measures as required by the City of San Diego to limit potential air quality impacts. Construction activities will be required to comply with the City's

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

Best Management Practices (BMPs) which are enforceable under San Diego Municipal Code (SDMC) Section 142.0710. Therefore, impacts associated with fugitive dust are considered less than significant and would not violate an air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.

### ***Long-Term (Operational) Emissions.***

Long-term air emission impacts are those associated with stationary sources and mobile sources related to any change caused by a project. Operation of a single-family residence would produce minimal stationary sources emissions. The project is compatible with the surrounding development and is permitted by the community plan and zone designation. As identified in the City's Significance Determination Thresholds, projects that would typically result in significant air quality impacts would include projects that would produce 9,500 Average Daily Trips (ADT). The scope and size of the project as described in the project description, does not exceed the City's Significance Determination Thresholds for Air Quality. Based on the residential land use, project emissions over the long-term are not anticipated to violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, nor would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the region is in non-attainment.

- |                                                                        |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

As described above, construction operations could temporarily increase the emissions of dust and other pollutants. However, construction emissions would be temporary and short-term in duration; implementation of Best Management Practices (BMPs) would reduce potential impacts related to construction activities to a less than significant level. Operation of a single-family residence would produce minimal stationary sources emissions. Therefore, the project would not result in the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. Impacts would be less than significant.

- |                                                                                                                   |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

### ***Short-term (Construction)***

Odors would be generated from vehicles and/or equipment exhaust emissions during construction of the project. Odors produced during construction would be attributable to concentrations of unburned hydrocarbons from tailpipes of construction equipment and architectural coatings. Such odors are temporary and generally occur at magnitudes that would not affect a substantial number of people. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

### ***Long-term (Operational)***

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

Typical long-term operational characteristics of the project are not associated with the creation of such odors nor anticipated to generate odors affecting a substantial number of people. Residential uses, in the long-term operation, are not typically associated with the creation of such odors nor are they anticipated to generate odors affecting a substantial number or people. Therefore, project operations would result in less than significant impacts.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

a) Have substantial adverse effects, 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 Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

The project site is located on a vacant, residentially zoned site with MHPA covering 0.364 acres of the project site. The site and adjacent area currently support three sensitive habitat types: Coastal Sage Scrub/Chaparral (CSC), Native Grassland (NG), and Non-native Grassland (NNG). Urban/Developed Habitat is adjacent to the east, west, and south of the site.

The project would encroach into the MHPA beyond the allowable development area pursuant to Sections 143.0142 and 131.0250(b) of the Land Development Code. As such, the project requires a MHPA boundary line adjustment which will be discussed further in Section XI.

Direct Impacts

Based on the project-specific Biological Technical Report (BTR) (Laguna Mountain Environmental, 2024), the project site and adjacent area currently supports three sensitive habitat types: Coastal Sage Scrub/Chaparral (CSC), Native Grassland (NG), and Non-native Grassland (NNG). Coastal Sage Scrub/Chaparral (CSC) habitat is Tier II, Native Grassland (NG) is Tier I, and Nonnative Grassland (NNG) is a Tier IIIB habitat.

The southern portion of the project parcel will be impacted as a result of the proposed project. The development area will impact the Non-native Grassland, Native Grassland, and portions of the Coastal Sage Scrub/Chaparral habitat areas. Zone 2 brush management will extend into Coastal Sage Scrub/Chaparral habitat, but this is considered impact neutral and not a direct impact.

Because the project consists of a previously undeveloped parcel, direct impacts to Native Grassland and Non-native grassland habitats will occur (Table 1). As currently designed, small impacts to Coastal Sage Scrub/Chaparral habitats will also occur.

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

**Table 1. Impacts to Sensitive Vegetation Communities**

Habitat Tier Type	On-Site Acreage	Not Impacted Area	Project Impact Area	Mitigation Ratio†	On-Site MHPA Area Mitigation Required
Coastal Sage Scrub/Chaparral (Tier II)	0.44	0.37	0.07	1:1	0.07
Native Grassland (Tier I)	0.03	0.00	0.03	1:1	0.03*
Non-native Grassland (Tier IIIB)	0.30	0.00	0.30	0.5:1	0.15
Developed/Disturbed (Tier IV)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0:1	0
Total	0.77	0.37	0.40	–	0.25

Source: Laguna Mountain Environmental (2024)

† With BLA, mitigation ratios assume impacts outside of MHPA and mitigation inside MHPA.

\* Tier 1 habitat mitigation would occur through payment into the Habitat Acquisition Fund and result in preservation of land inside the MHPA, but outside of the specific project area.

Direct impacts associated with this project would be mitigated through on-site preservation of the appropriate amount of vegetation, in the appropriate Tier, within the MHPA for habitat impacts. Tier 1 habitat is not available within the MHPA area on-site. Direct impacts to 0.03 acres of Tier 1 Native Grassland habitat would be mitigated through payment into the Habitat Acquisition Fund (HAF). Mitigation through the HAF would be within the MHPA so a 1:1 mitigation ratio was used.

Required onsite mitigation within the MHPA portion of the parcel outside of Brush Management Zone 2 area would include approximately 0.22 acre of Coastal Sage Scrub/Chaparral (Tier II) habitat as mitigation for impacts to 0.3 acres of Non-native Grassland and 0.07 acres of Coastal Sage Scrub/Chaparral. On-site mitigation would be included within a covenant of easement (COE) to protect it from future development and managed in accordance with a Long-Term Management Plan to be approved prior to issuance of any construction permits including but not limited to, the first Grading Permit, Demolition Plans/Permits and Building Plans/Permits. With implementation of mitigation, impacts to sensitive vegetation would be less than significant.

Sensitive plants are those listed by the USFWS (2010, 2011), CDFG (2012, 2010), and California Native Plant Society's Electronic Inventory of Rare and Endangered Vascular Plants of California database (CNPS online) and previous candidates for listing.

One sensitive plant species was found on site and observed on public lands to the south and southeast. This is Decumbant goldenbush (*Isocoma menszeisii* var. *decumbans*) a California Rare

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

Plant Rank 1B.2. A single Torrey Pine (*Pinus torreyana* ssp. *torreyana*) appears to be an intrusive tree on the property within the Coastal Sage Scrub/Chaparral habitat. Torrey Pines are California Rare Plant Rank 1B.2, State Rank S1, and Global Rank G1T1.

Direct impacts would occur to approximately 274 Decumbant goldenbush (*Isocoma menszeizii* var. *decumbans*) plants within the project parcel. While numerous plants will be impacted, this species is present on public lands in the adjacent area and impacts do not represent a threat to the continued existence of this species. The single Torrey Pine (*Pinus torreyana* ssp. *torreyana*) tree is within the MHPA addition area and is located away from proposed development. As such, no significant impacts will occur to sensitive plant species.

Sensitive animal species include those species listed by the City of San Diego MSCP Subarea Plan (1997), USFWS (2010, 2011), CDFG (2009, 2010), and Candidates for listing. The City of San Diego's MSCP Subarea Plan stipulates that the City regulate populations of certain sensitive animals within the boundaries circumscribed by the MSCP Subarea Plan.

No sensitive wildlife species were observed onsite. There is a moderate potential of occurrence for Crotch's bumble bee in the project area. The Crotch's bumble bee became a candidate species for listing under the California Endangered Species Act in June of 2019. It is not a covered species under the City of San Diego's MSCP. A Focused Survey Report for the Crotch's Bumble Bee (Laguna Mountain Environmental, 2024) was prepared for the project. Previous biological surveys of the project area were used as a habitat assessment evaluating the likelihood of bumble bees occurring within and adjacent to the project area. The open, southern portion of the project area contains sufficient habitat and nectar resources for bumble bees. Species in the Native Grassland habitat that could provide resources include Decumbant goldenbush (*Isocoma menziesii* var. *decumbans*), Blue-eyed grass (*Sisyrinchium bellum*), Common goldenstar (*Bloomeria crocea* var. *crocea*), and Checker-bloom (*Sidalcea sparsifolia*). In the Non-native Grassland habitat Hottentot-fig (*Carpobrotus edulis*) also provides a significant foraging resource during the Colony Active Season. As part of the focused survey report, three separate surveys were conducted in May 2024. No Crotch's bumble bees were identified during any of the surveys. No potential nesting habitat was observed onsite. Although the bumble bee was not observed onsite, suitable foraging resources are onsite. Therefore, an avoidance measure is included as a condition of approval to avoid potential impacts to foraging Crotch's bumble bees during construction. With implementation of the avoidance measure, impacts to sensitive wildlife species would be less than significant.

#### Indirect Impacts:

Development adjacent to the MHPA must ensure that indirect impacts to the MHPA are minimized. The City's MSCP Subarea Plan outlines the requirements for Land Use Adjacency Guidelines (LUAGs) to address indirect effects related to drainage, toxics, lighting, noise, barriers, invasive plant species, brush management, and grading/land development. Additionally, indirect impacts could occur as a result of fugitive dust. Because the project would include development adjacent to MHPA, the LUAGs would be included as a condition of project approval. Indirect impacts to sensitive wildlife and plant species would be precluded with implementation of the MHPA LUAGs. Project specific compliance is described in Land Use, Section XI (b). Furthermore, implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-1

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

would reduce potential indirect impacts to sensitive biological resources during construction to a less than significant level.

- b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

☐
☐
☐
☒

The project site does not contain any riparian habitat. The project would impact Coastal Sage Scrub/Chaparral (CSC), Native Grassland (NG), and Non-native Grassland (NNG). Refer to IV (a).

- c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands (including but not limited to marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

☐
☐
☐
☒

There are no drainages or wetland features on or adjacent to the project site that would be impacted by the project. No fill or direct removal or hydrological interruption of federally or state protected jurisdictional features (wetlands and non-wetland waters) would be needed to implement the proposed project. No impact would occur.

- 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?

☐
☐
☐
☒

There are no known wildlife corridors in the project area. The existing habitat is part of an island of habitat in a larger urban landscape. It does not include any drainage systems that might act as wildlife corridors. As such, the project would result in no impacts to wildlife corridors.

- e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

☐
☒
☐
☐

The project site contains sensitive habitats and steep slopes considered ESL by the SDMC ESL Regulations (Chapter 14, Article 3, Division 1). The project is complying with allowable encroachment into steep hillsides. The ESL regulations require that impacts to sensitive biological resources must be assessed, and mitigation provided where necessary, as required by Section III of the City's Biology Guidelines (City 2018). The ESL regulations also specify development requirements inside and outside of the MHPA. Although the project would result in impacts to sensitive biological resources, mitigation will be required in accordance to the City's Biology Guidelines (2018) as described under Section IV(a). The project would encroach into the MHPA beyond the allowable development area pursuant to Sections 143.0142 and 131.0250(b) of the Land Development Code. As such, the project

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

requires a MHPA boundary line adjustment as discussed under Section XI(b). As such, impacts associated with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources would be less than significant, with the incorporation of mitigation measures BIO-1, BIO-2, and BIO-3 for impacts to sensitive biological resources.

f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

As discussed above, the proposed project would encroach into the MHPA beyond the allowable development area pursuant to Sections 143.0142 and 131.0250(b) of the Land Development Code, requiring a MHPA boundary line adjustment (BLA). The proposed BLA associated with the project is required to preclude impacts to local ordinances. No impact would occur.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

The purpose and intent of the Historical Resources Regulations of the Land Development Code (Chapter 14, Division 3, and Article 2) is to protect, preserve and, where damaged, restore the historical resources of San Diego. The regulations apply to all proposed development within the City of San Diego when historical resources are present on the premises. Before approving discretionary projects, CEQA requires the Lead Agency to identify and examine the significant adverse environmental effects which may result from that project. A project that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource may have a significant effect on the environment (sections 15064.5(b) and 21084.1). A substantial adverse change is defined as demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration activities, which would impair historical significance (sections 15064.5(b)(1)). Any historical resource listed in, or eligible to be listed in the California Register of Historical Resources, including archaeological resources, is considered to be historically or culturally significant.

Archaeological Resources

Many areas of San Diego County, including mesas and the coast, are known for intense and diverse prehistoric occupation and important archaeological and historical resources. The region has been inhabited by various cultural groups spanning 10,000 years or more. Per the San Diego Land Development Manual- Historical Resources Guidelines, an Archaeological survey is required when development is proposed on previously undeveloped parcels when a known resource is identified on site or within a one-mile radius, if the potential for resources exists, or based on a site visit by a qualified consultant or knowledgeable City staff.

Since the project site is undeveloped and located in a culturally sensitive area, an Archaeological Report (Laguna Mountain Environmental, 2024) was prepared for the project. The archaeological records search revealed that three historic resources have been identified within a one-quarter mile radius of the project and various prehistoric cultural resources are present within approximately three-quarters of a mile. The cultural resource survey resulted in no indications of prehistoric or historic material on the surface of the parcel and proposed impact area. Surface visibility was poor, limiting survey visibility and access. Because of the lack of visibility and the presence of cultural resources in the project vicinity it was determined that the project could result in significant impacts



Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

to cultural resources. Therefore, archaeological and Native American construction monitoring is required as a mitigation measure to reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

#### Built Environment

The City of San Diego criteria for determination of historic significance, pursuant to CEQA, is evaluated based upon age (over 45 years), location, context, association with an important event, uniqueness, or structural integrity of the building. In addition, projects requiring the demolition of structures that are 45 years or older are also reviewed for historic significance in compliance with CEQA. The lot is currently vacant; therefore, there are no structures over 45 years old. No impact is identified.

- |                                                                                                               |                          |                                     |                          |                          |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

Refer to response V(a) above. Impacts to archaeological resources would be less than significant with the implementation of an archaeological monitoring as mitigation.

- |                                                                                         |                          |                                     |                          |                          |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

Refer to response V(b) above. Section V of the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program contains provisions for the discovery of human remains. If human remains are discovered, work shall halt in that area and no soil shall be exported off-site until a determination can be made regarding the provenance of the human remains; and the following procedures as set forth in CEQA Section 15064.5(e), the California Public Resources Code (Sec. 5097.98) and State Health and Safety Code (Sec. 7050.5) shall be undertaken. Based upon the required mitigation measure impacts would be less than significant.

#### VI. ENERGY – Would the project:

- |                                                                                                                                                                                   |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The project would be required to meet mandatory energy standards of the current California energy code. Construction of the proposed project would require operation of heavy equipment but would be temporary and short-term in duration. Additionally, long-term energy usage from the buildings would be reduced through design measures that incorporate energy conservation features in heating, ventilation and air conditioning systems, lighting and window treatments, and insulation and weather stripping. Development of the project would not result in a significant environmental



Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources. Impacts would remain less than significant.

- |                                                                                               |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The project is consistent with the General Plan and the La Jolla Community Plan's land use designation. The project is required to comply with the City's Climate Action Plan (CAP) and associated CAP Consistency Regulations that were adopted and became effective for all areas within the Coastal Overlay Zone on June 8, 2023. Therefore, the project would not obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. No impacts would result.

#### VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS – Would the project:

- |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Directly or indirectly cause 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 fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

A Preliminary Geotechnical and Geologic Fault Investigation (Geotechnical Exploration, Inc., July 2022) and Addendum (Geotechnical Exploration, Inc., May 2023) were prepared for the project. As described in the report, according to the City of San Diego Seismic Safety Study, Geologic Hazards Map indicates that the site is located in a geologic hazard area designated as Geologic Hazard Category (GHC) 12 and 27. GHC 12 is a fault buffer zone described as "Potentially Active, Inactive, Presumed Inactive, or Activity Unknowns." GHC 27 is a slide prone formation described as "Otay, Sweetwater, and others." As described in the Geotechnical Report, based on site reconnaissance, data obtained from the field investigation, and geologic maps, it is the opinion of the geologist that an active or potentially active fault does not underlie the site. The site is not located in an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. No active faults are known to underlie or project toward the site. Therefore, the probability of fault rupture is considered low. Additionally, the project would be required to comply with seismic requirement of the California Building Code, utilize proper engineering design and utilization of standard construction practices, to be verified at the building permit stage, in order to ensure that potential impacts based on regional geologic hazards would remain less than significant.

- |                                    |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

The site could be affected by seismic activity as a result of earthquakes on major active faults located throughout the Southern California area, however, the project would utilize proper engineering design and utilization of standard construction practices, to be verified at the building permit stage, in order to ensure that potential impacts from regional geologic hazards would remain less than significant and mitigation is not required.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Liquefaction occurs when loose, unconsolidated, water-laden soils are subject to shaking, causing the soils to lose cohesion. According to the Geotechnical Investigation, in the areas of the proposed habitable structures, the risk of liquefaction of formational materials due to seismic shaking is considered to be very low due to the dense nature of the underlying formational materials and lack of shallow static groundwater. Additionally, the project would utilize proper engineering design and utilization of standard construction practices, to be verified at the building permit stage, in order to ensure that potential impacts from seismic-related ground failure would remain less than significant and mitigation is not required.

iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
-----------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

According to the Geotechnical Report, based on the geotechnical investigation, as well as geologic maps, the site is not underlain by a landslide complex or a recent or active landslide. Additionally, the project would utilize proper engineering design and utilization of standard construction practices, to be verified at the building permit stage, in order to ensure that potential impacts from regional geologic hazards would remain less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Construction activities would temporarily expose soils to increased erosion potential. The project would be required to comply with the City's Storm Water Standards which requires the implementation of appropriate Best Management Practices (BMPs). Grading activities within the site would be required to comply with the City of San Diego Grading Ordinance as well as the Storm Water Standards, which would ensure soil erosion and topsoil loss is minimized to less than significant levels. Furthermore, permanent storm water BMPs would also be required postconstruction consistent with the City's regulations, along with landscape regulations. Therefore, the project would not result in substantial soils erosion or loss of topsoil. Impacts would be less than significant.

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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

As discussed in Section VII (a) and VII (b), the project site is not likely to be subject to landslides, and the potential for liquefaction and subsidence is low. According to the Geotechnical Report, the slope stability analysis indicated that the site is stable. Additionally, it is the opinion of the Geologist that the proposed development would not destabilize neighboring properties or induce the settlement of adjacent structures or right-of-way improvements if designed and constructed in accordance with the recommendations provided in the Geotechnical Report. Additionally, the project design would be required to comply with the requirements of the California Building Code, ensuring hazards associated with destabilization would be reduced to an acceptable level of risk. As such, impacts are expected to be less than significant.

- d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?

☐
☐
☒
☐

According to the Geotechnical Report, the slopewash and terrace materials overlying the upper 1 to 3 feet of the site possess a high potential for expansion and formational materials underlying the site possess a very low to low potential for expansion. The Geotechnical Investigation provides project-specific recommendations, which will ensure proper site preparation and construction activities for onsite soils. Additionally, the project would be required to comply with seismic requirements of the California Building Code that would reduce impacts to people or structures due to local seismic events to an acceptable level of risk. Implementation of proper engineering design and utilization of standard construction practices, to be verified at the building permit stage, would ensure that the potential for impacts from expansive soils would remain less than significant.

- 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 waste water?

☐
☐
☐
☒

The project site is located within an area that is already developed with existing infrastructure (i.e., water and sewer lines) and does not propose a septic system. No impacts would occur.

- f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

☐
☐
☒
☐

According to the Geotechnical Investigation, the site is overlain with Slopewash (Qsw) in the central portion of the site from approximately 1 to 3 feet in thickness. Very Old Paralic Deposit materials, known as Marine Terrace Deposits (Qvop10) were encountered in the southern portion of the site from approximately 1 to 3 feet in thickness, and the Cabrillo Formation Sandstone (Kcs) was encountered beneath the fill soil and Marine Terrace Deposits on the entire project area at a relatively shallow depth.

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

Slopewash has unknown sensitivity, and Marine Terrace Deposits and Cabrillo Formation Sandstone have a moderate sensitivity for the discovery of paleontological resources.

Paleontological resources monitoring is required under San Diego Municipal Code section 142.0151 if project grading involves 2,000 cubic yards or greater, and 10 feet or greater in depth, in a moderate resource potential geologic deposit/formation/rock unit. The project would require 4,682 cubic yards of cut to a depth of 20.6 ft and 78 cubic yards of fill to a depth of 6 feet, requiring export of 4,604 cubic yards. Therefore, the proposed project would necessitate paleontological monitoring per the municipal code and impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

#### VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS – Would the project:

- |                                                                                                                             |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The 2022 Climate Action Plan (CAP) and associated CAP Consistency Regulations were adopted and became effective for all areas within the Coastal Overlay Zone on June 8, 2023. The project is consistent with the General Plan and the La Jolla Community Plan's land use and zoning designations. Compliance with the CAP Consistency Regulations would reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions impacts associated with the project to below a level of significance.

- |                                                                                                                                   |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purposes of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases. The project is consistent with the existing General Plan and Community Plan land use and zoning designations. The project will be required to comply with the CAP Consistency Regulations and impacts are considered less than significant.

#### IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Would the project:

- |                                                                                                                                     |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The City's Thresholds states that significant impacts may occur if a project proposes the handling, storage, and treatment of hazardous materials.

Construction activities for the project would involve using potentially hazardous materials, including vehicle fuels, oils, transmission fluids, paint, adhesives, surface coatings, and other finishing materials, cleaning solvents, and pesticides for landscaping purposes. However, the use of these hazardous materials would be temporary, and all potentially hazardous materials would be stored, used, and disposed of per manufacturers' specifications, applicable federal, state, and local health

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

and safety regulations. As such, impacts associated with the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials would be less than significant during construction.

- 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?

☐
☐
☒
☐

The City's Thresholds state that project sites on or near known contamination sources and/ or that meet one or more of the following criteria may result in a significant impact:

- A project is located within 1,000 feet of a known contamination site;
- A project is located within 2,000 feet of a known "border zone property" (also known as a "Superfund" site) or a hazardous waste property subject to corrective action pursuant to the Health and Safety Code;
- The project has a closed Department of Environmental Health (DEH) site file;
- A project is located in Centre City San Diego, Barrio Logan, or other areas known or suspected to contain contamination sites;
- A project is located on or near an active or former landfill;
- A project is located on properties historically developed with industrial or commercial uses which involved dewatering (the removal of groundwater during excavation), in conjunction with major excavation in an area with high groundwater;
- A project is located in a designated airport influence area and where the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) has reached a determination of "hazard" through FAA Form 7460-1, "Notice of Proposed Construction or Alteration" , inconsistent with an Airport's Land Use Compatibility Plan (ACLUP), within the boundaries of an Airport Land Use Plan (ALP), or two nautical miles of a public or public use airport; or
- A project is located on a site presently or previously used for agricultural purposes.

The project site does not meet any of the criteria outlined in the City's Thresholds stated above. The project site was not listed in any of the databases for hazardous materials including being listed in the State Water Resources Control Board GeoTracker system, which includes leaking underground fuel tank sites inclusive of spills, leaks, investigations, and cleanups Program or the Department of Toxic Substances Control EnviroStor Data Management System, which includes CORTESE sites. Impacts would be less than significant.

Issue	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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The City's Thresholds states that significant impacts may occur if a project proposes the handling, storage and treatment of hazardous materials. The proposed project location is not within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. Therefore, project would not 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 would result.

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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

See IX(b) above for applicable City Threshold related to listed hazardous materials sites. A hazardous waste site records search was completed on March 30, 2022 using Geo Tracker and EnviroStor, online websites which disclose hazardous clean-up sites pursuant to Government Code section 65962.5: <http://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/>; <https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/> The records search identified that no hazardous materials sites pursuant to Government Code section 65962.5 exist onsite or in the surrounding area. No Impacts would result.

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two mile of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The City's Thresholds state that a project may result in a significant impact if it is in a designated airport influence area and where the FAA has reached a determination of "hazard" through FAA Form 7460-1, "Notice of Proposed Construction or Alteration", inconsistent with an Airport's Land Use Compatibility Plan (ACLUP), within the boundaries of an Airport Land Use Plan (ALP), or two nautical miles of a public or public use airport.

The proposed project is not located within an airport land use plan, or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. No impacts would result.

f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

The proposed project is residential development in an established neighborhood. It would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. No impacts would result.

- |                                                                                                                                         |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Brush Management is required for development that is adjacent to any highly flammable area of native or naturalized vegetation. These fire hazard conditions currently exist for the proposed development. Where brush management is required, a comprehensive program is required to reduce fire hazards around all structures by providing an effective fire-break between structures and contiguous area of flammable vegetation. The fire-break is required to consist of two distinct brush management zones as required in Section 142.0412 of the Municipal Code. The graded and landscaped portion of the site around the proposed residences adjacent to native habitat are considered part of the project development and are required to be covered by BMZ 1 regulations. The native habitat to the rear of the site are required to be covered by BMZ 2 regulations requiring thinning and pruning to reduce the fuel-load of vegetation. To achieve the required brush management for the proposed residence, the Brush Management Program includes a Zone One ranging from 42-ft. to 54-ft. in width with a corresponding Zone Two of 35.5-ft. to 54.5-ft. in width, exercising Zone Two reduction options under §142.0412(f).

The project includes lands within the MHPA that contain native vegetation that is subject to wildland fires, however, proper brush management zones will be implemented in the project design as to decrease the probability of exposing any people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death due to wildland fires. BMZ 2 would not encroach into the onsite mitigation area but would include land within the MHPA. However, BMZ 2 within the MHPA is considered impact neutral. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY - Would the project:

- |                                                                                                                                           |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

A project-specific Hydrology and Drainage Report (Labib Funk + Associates, 2025), Stormwater Quality Management Plan (SWQMP) (Labib Funk + Associates, 2025), and project design were reviewed by City Engineering staff. The project was reviewed for applicable water quality standards and water discharge requirements. Based on staff review, the project would not have a significant impact on downstream properties and the drainage system. The onsite drainage system, consisting of a modular wetland biofiltration system and storm drain connections, would be engineered to adequately manage site stormwater. The project would be conditioned to comply with the City's Storm Water Regulations during and after construction, and appropriate BMPs would be utilized.

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

Implementation of project specific BMPs would preclude violations of any existing water quality standards or discharge requirements. Impacts would be less than significant.

- b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?

☐
☐
☒
☐

The project does not require the construction of wells or the use of groundwater. The project would be conditioned to include pervious design features and appropriate drainage. Therefore, the project would not introduce a significant amount of new impervious surfaces that could interfere with groundwater recharge. The project as designed was reviewed by qualified City staff and would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge. The project is located in a residential neighborhood where all infrastructures exist. The project would connect to the existing public water system. Impacts would be less than significant.

- c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:

- i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;

☐
☐
☐
☒

Proper landscaping would prevent substantial erosion onsite. No stream or river is located on or adjacent to the site. All runoff would be routed to the proposed modular wetland biofiltration system and the existing storm drain system and would therefore, not substantially alter existing drainage patterns. No impact would result due to implementation of the project.

- ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site;

☐
☐
☐
☒

Please see X.c., no flooding would occur. No impact would result due to implementation of the project.

- iii) 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; or

☐
☐
☐
☒



Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

Based on City of San Diego review, the proposed residence would be adequately served by existing municipal storm water drainage facilities, therefore no impacts would occur. Potential release of sediment or other pollutants into surface water drainages downstream from the site will be precluded by implementation of Best Management Practices (BMPs) required by City of San Diego regulations, in compliance with San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board requirements to implement the federal Clean Water Act. Therefore, no significant surface water quality impacts are expected to result from the proposed activity. Proper irrigation and landscaping would ensure that runoff would be controlled and unpolluted. No impact would result due to implementation of the project.

iv) impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The on-site drainage patterns will be altered slightly but discharge locations will be maintained. The project would not impede or redirect flood flows. The project would be required to comply with all City storm water standards during and after construction ensuring that project runoff is directed to appropriate drainage systems. Impacts would be less than significant.

d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The project site is not located within a flood hazard zone, and it is not likely that a tsunami or seiche could impact the site due to the site elevation and distance from any bodies of water. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The project would be required to comply with all City storm water standards during and after construction. Appropriate best management practices would be implemented to ensure that water quality is not degraded; therefore, ensuring that project runoff is directed to appropriate drainage systems. Any runoff from the site is not anticipated to exceed the capacity of existing storm water systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. Additionally, the project does not require the construction of wells or the use of groundwater. Therefore, the project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a sustainable groundwater management plan. Impacts would be less than significant.

#### XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING – Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
------------------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

The project is consistent with the General Plan and La Jolla Community Plan land use designation. The project site is located within a developed residential neighborhood and surrounded by similar residential development. The development of a single dwelling unit would not affect adjacent properties and is consistent with surrounding land uses. Therefore, the project would not physically divide an established community. No impact would result due to implementation of the project.

- b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

☐
☐
☒
☐

As previously identified, the project site lies within the boundaries of the City San Diego Multiple Species Conservation Plan (MSCP) Subarea Plan. The City's Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA) is mapped onsite; more specifically, the MHPA is mapped through the central portion of the lot. MHPA Lands are those that have been included within the City's MSCP Subarea Plan for habitat conservation. These lands have been determined to provide the necessary habitat quality, quantity, and connectivity to sustain the unique biodiversity of the San Diego region. A Biological Technical Report was prepared for the project (Laguna Mountain Environmental, Inc.) in order to assess the vegetation communities on site and determine what impacts would result through project implementation.

The project would encroach into the MHPA beyond the allowable development area pursuant to Sections 143.0142 and 131.0250(b) of the Land Development Code and pages 13-15 of the City's Biology Guidelines, requiring a MHPA Boundary Line Adjustment (BLA). Under the City's MSCP Subarea Plan, an adjustment to the City's MHPA boundary is allowed only if the new MHPA boundary results in an exchange of lands that are functionally equivalent or higher in biological value. A determination of functionally equivalent or higher biological value will be based on site-specific information (both quantitative and qualitative) that addresses the six boundary adjustment criteria outlined in Section 5.4.3 of the Final MSCP Plan (August 1998), which are as follows:

*1. Effects on significantly and sufficiently conserved habitats (i.e., the exchange maintains or improves the conservation, configuration, or status of significantly and sufficiently conserved habitats, as defined in Section 3.4.2 [of the MSCP Plan]);*

The current exchange maintains conservation configuration and status of significantly and sufficiently conserved habitats. The addition of contiguous habitat and removal of a small segment surrounded on two sides by existing development should result in improved conservation. The project also includes mitigation through easement dedication that will ensure future conservation of the MSCP lands. The MHPA boundary line adjustment, as proposed, would maintain the conservation, general configuration, and status of significantly and sufficiently conserved habitats.

*2. Effects on covered species (i.e., the exchange maintains or increases the conservation of covered species);*

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

The project exchange does not affect covered species, therefore the exchange maintains the existing conservation of covered species.

*3. Effects on habitat linkages and function of preserve areas (i.e., the exchange maintains or improves any habitat linkages or wildlife corridors);*

The project exchange would not affect existing habitat linkages and function of preserve areas. The added northern extension of the preserve has native habitat on three sides, whereas the habitat being exchanged out has development on two sides and will be developed on a third side. This will provide greater connectivity with adjacent habitat.

*4. Effects on preserve configuration and management (i.e., the exchange results in similar or improved management efficiency and/or protection of biological resources);*

The project exchange has minimal impact on preserve configuration, because it consists of adjacent lands and has a positive impact on management by providing access connectivity with an existing road easement. The MHPA boundary line adjustment, as proposed, would maintain the conservation of covered species. It would maintain the habitat linkages and function of the preserve area. It would have little effect on preserve configuration and no effect on preserve management.

*5. Effects on ecotones or other conditions affecting species diversity (i.e., the exchange maintains topographic and structural diversity and habitat interfaces of the preserve);*

The project exchange does not affect ecotones or species diversity and maintains topographic and structural diversity and habitat interfaces of the preserve.

*6. Effects on species of concern not on the covered species list (i.e., the exchange does not significantly increase the likelihood that an uncovered species will meet the criteria for listing under either the federal or state ESAs).*

The project will not significantly affect species of concern not on the covered species list. It will not significantly increase the likelihood that an uncovered species will meet the criteria for listing under either the federal or state ESAs. The MHPA boundary line adjustment, as proposed, would maintain the existing ecotones and other conditions affecting species diversity. It would not result in any effects to species of concern not on the covered species list.

The MHPA BLA would incorporate an equal area of habitat on the northern end of the parcel into the MHPA area, resulting in no net loss of area or habitat to the MHPA as shown in Table 2. There is no feasible location for on-site mitigation for Tier 1 Native Grassland Habitat due to the remaining, intact Coastal Sage Scrub habitat within the on-site MHPA. Removal of 0.006 acres of Tier 1 Native Grassland habitat from the MHPA on-site would be mitigated through payment into the Habitat Acquisition Fund (HAF). Mitigation through the HAF would result in preservation of Tier 1 habitat within the MHPA so a 1:1 mitigation ratio was used. No net loss of Tier 1 habitat within the MHPA will occur as a result of the boundary adjustment. The project also includes mitigation through easement dedication that will ensure future conservation of the MSCP lands.

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

**Table 2. MHPA Boundary Adjustment Summary**

Tier	Habitat	Existing MHPA	Proposed Encroachment	Proposed Addition	Net Change
Tier II	Coastal Sage Scrub/ Chaparral	0.342	0.053	0.075	0.022
Tier I	Native Grassland	0.006	0.006	0.000	-0.006
Tier IIIB	Non-native Grassland	0.016	0.016	0.000	-0.016
Tier IV	Developed/Disturbed	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Total		0.364	0.075	0.075	0.000

Source: Laguna Mountain Environmental (2024)

City MHPA staff and the Wildlife Agencies determined that the boundary line adjustment would retain the biological value of the City's MHPA and therefore, approved the MHPA BLA on February 19, 2025.

The proposed project will comply with the MSCP general management directives by avoiding significant impacts to, and maintaining, a system of canyons and open space that provide habitat for native species remaining in urban areas. The MHPA boundary line adjustment, as proposed, and the onsite and offsite mitigation proposed will not adversely affect the MHPA or species associated with the MSCP. No impacts to covered species are proposed by this project and the MHPA Preserve system will not be impacted by this project. The proposed project will comply with the MSCP general management directives through design and implementation of mitigation measures.

Due to the presence of the MHPA, "edge effects" could result because of the potential introduction of drainage, toxics, lighting, noise, invasives, grading, barriers and brush management that can indirectly affect adjacent habitat and wildlife species. Indirect impacts to the MHPA would be avoided with the application of the MHPA Land Use Adjacency Guidelines (LUAG) as conditions of approval as outlined in the City's MSCP Subarea Plan (Section 1.4.3). Therefore, in order to ensure that the project would not result in any indirect impacts, the project would be required to comply with the MHPA LUAG. Compliance with the MHPA LUAG would reduce impacts to below a level of significance.

More specifically, drainage would be directed away from the MHPA, and/or would not drain directly into these areas. Light would be directed away from the MHPA and be consistent with the City's lighting regulations which would require exterior lighting to be low-level lights and directed away from native habitat or shielded to minimize light pollution. Landscape plantings would consist of only native plant species. Brush Management Zone One would occur outside of the MHPA and within the development footprint. Brush Management Zone Two would occur within the MHPA and

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

comply with the requirements that only 50 percent of the existing native vegetation be thinned. In addition, no staging/storage area would be allowed to be located within or adjacent to sensitive biological areas and no equipment maintenance would be permitted. With respect to grading, the limits of grading would be clearly demarcated by the biological monitor to ensure no impacts occur outside those area delineated. Additionally, the project does not anticipate establishment of any new barriers that would affect the normal functioning of wildlife movements in the adjacent MHPA.

Additionally, due to the site's location adjacent to the MHPA, construction noise will need to be avoided, during the breeding season of the California gnatcatcher (3/1-8/15). If construction is proposed during the breeding season for the species, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service protocol surveys will be required in order to determine species presence/absence. If the species is not identified within the MHPA, no additional measures will be required. If present, measures to avoid noise related impacts to CAGN would be required, including but not limited to noise walls, berms and monitoring. Furthermore, if present, Noise levels from construction activities during the bird breeding season should not exceed 60 dBA hourly LEQ at the edge of the occupied MHPA, or if the ambient noise level if noise levels already exceed 60 dBA hourly LEQ.

Therefore, with implementation of LUAGs, indirect impacts related to Land Use/MSCP would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

## XII. MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

- |                                                                                                                                        |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

There are no known mineral resources located on the project site. The urbanized and developed nature of the project vicinity would preclude the extraction of any such resources. No impacts would result.

- |                                                                                                                                                                       |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

See XII (a), above. The project site has not been delineated on a local general, specific or other land use plan as a locally important mineral resource recovery site, and no such resources would be affected with project implementation. Therefore, no impacts were identified.

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIII. NOISE – Would the project result in:				
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

#### Short-term (Construction)

Short-term noise impacts would be associated with onsite grading, and construction activities of the project. Construction-related short-term noise levels would be higher than existing ambient noise levels in the project area but would no longer occur once construction is completed. Sensitive receptors (e.g. residential uses) occur in the immediate area and may be temporarily affected by construction noise; however, construction activities would be required to comply with the construction hours specified in the City's Municipal Code (Section 59.5.0404, Construction Noise) which are intended to reduce potential adverse effects resulting from construction noise. Additionally, the project would be required to comply with MHPA Land Use Adjacency Guidelines with respect to noise. As described above, due to the site's location adjacent to the MHPA, construction noise will need to be avoided, during the breeding season of the California gnatcatcher (3/1-8/15). If construction is proposed during the breeding season for the species, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service protocol surveys will be required in order to determine species presence/absence. If the species is not identified within the MHPA, no additional measures will be required. If present, measures to avoid noise related impacts to CAGN would be required, including but not limited to noise walls, berms and monitoring. Furthermore, if present, Noise levels from construction activities during the bird breeding season should not exceed 60 dBA hourly LEQ at the edge of the occupied MHPA, or if the ambient noise level if noise levels already exceed 60 dBA hourly LEQ. Therefore, with compliance with LUAG, impacts would be less than significant.

#### Long-term (Operation)

For the long-term, typical noise levels associated with residential uses are anticipated, and the project would not result in a significant increase in the existing ambient noise level. The project would not result in noise levels in excess of standards established in the City of San Diego General Plan or Noise Ordinance. Impacts would be less than significant.

b) Generation of, excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Potential effects from construction noise would be reduced through compliance with the City restrictions. Pile driving activities that would potentially result in ground borne vibration or ground borne noise would not be required with construction of the project. Impacts would be less than significant.

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The project is not located within the vicinity of an airstrip, airport, or an airport land use plan. Potential short-term effects from construction noise would be reduced through compliance with City restrictions. No significant long-term impacts would occur, and no mitigation measures are required. No impact would occur.

#### XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING – Would the project:

a) Induce substantial unplanned 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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The proposed construction of one single-family residence is consistent with the La Jolla Community Plan's land use designation of Very Low Density Residential (0-5 DU/AC) and Parks, Open Space, and the underlying zone of RS-1-1.

The project would only require connections to existing water and sewer service from the City available in the vicinity and no other extension of infrastructure to new areas is required. As such, the project would not substantially increase housing or population growth in the area. No roadway improvements are proposed as part of the project. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No such displacement would result. The project would construct one new single-dwelling unit on an undeveloped parcel. No impacts would occur.

#### XV. PUBLIC SERVICES

a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provisions 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 rations, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
i) Fire protection;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

The project site is located in an urbanized and developed area where fire protection services are already provided. The project would not adversely affect existing levels of fire protection services to the area, and would not require the construction of new or expansion of existing governmental facilities. Impacts related to fire protection would be less than significant.

ii) Police protection; ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

The project site is located in an urbanized and developed area within the City of San Diego where police protection services are already provided. The project would not adversely affect existing levels of police protection services or create significant new significant demand, and would not require the construction of new or expansion of existing governmental facilities. As such, impacts related to police protection would be less than significant.

iii) Schools; ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

The project would not affect existing levels of public services and would not require the construction or expansion of a school facility. The project site is located in an urbanized and developed area where public school services are available. The project would not significantly increase the demand on public schools over that which currently exists and is not anticipated to result in a significant increase in demand for public educational services. As such, impacts related to school services would be less than significant.

iv) Parks; ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

The project site is located in an urbanized and developed area where City-operated parks are available. The project would not significantly increase the demand on existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities over that which presently exists and is not anticipated to result in a significant increase in demand for parks or other offsite recreational facilities. As such, impacts related to parks would be less than significant.

v) Other public facilities? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

The project site is located in an urbanized and developed area where City services are already available. The project would not adversely affect existing levels of public services and not require the construction or expansion of an existing governmental facility. Impacts related to other public facilities would be less than significant.

#### XVI. RECREATION

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? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐



Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

The project would not adversely affect the availability of and/or need for new or expanded recreational resources. The project would not adversely affect existing levels of public services and would not require the construction or expansion of an existing governmental facility. The project would not significantly increase the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities as the project would construct one single dwelling unit. Therefore, the project is not anticipated to result in the use of available parks or facilities such that substantial deterioration occurs, or that would require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities to satisfy demand. As such, a less than significant impact related to recreational facilities would result.

- |                                                                                                                                                                                          |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The project does not propose the construction of recreational facilities, nor does it require the expansion of recreation facilities. No impact would occur.

#### XVII. TRANSPORTATION-

- |                                                                                                                                                                                                       |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Would the project or plan/policy conflict with an adopted program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the transportation system, including transit, roadways, bicycle and pedestrian facilities? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The project is consistent with the La Jolla community plan designation and underlying zone. The project would not change existing circulation patterns on area roadways; however, a temporary minor increase in traffic may occur during construction. No forms of mass transit (e.g. busses, trolley) are present on Via Casa Alta. No designated bicycle paths are present on Via Casa Alta. The project would not conflict with any applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system. The project is not expected to cause a significant short-term or long-term increase in traffic volumes, and therefore, would not adversely affect existing levels of service along roadways. Impacts are considered less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

- |                                                                                                                                         |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| b) Would the project or plan/policy result in VMT exceeding thresholds identified in the City of San Diego Transportation Study Manual? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

The project would construct one new single-family residence. A “Small Project” is defined as a project generating less than 300 daily unadjusted driveway trips using the City of San Diego trip generation rates/procedures.

The project qualifies as a “Small Project” and is screened out from further Vehicle Miles Traveled analysis. Therefore, as recommended in the City of San Diego TSM, the project would be presumed have a less than significant impact.

- |                                                                                                                                                                                         |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c) Would the project or plan/policy substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The project would not alter existing circulation patterns on Via Casa Alta. No design features or incompatible uses that would increase potential hazards are proposed and the project would not affect emergency access to the site or adjacent properties. Driveway design for the new single-family residence would be consistent with City design requirements to ensure safe ingress/egress from the property. Additionally, as the project site is located in an existing residential neighborhood, it would not result in incompatible uses that would create hazardous conditions. Therefore, no impact would occur.

- |                                           |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|-------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| d) Result in inadequate emergency access? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|-------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The project would be subject to City review and approval for consistency with all design requirements to ensure that no impediments to emergency access would occur. No impact would result.

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:

- |                                                                                                                                                                                                |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The project site is vacant and is not listed nor is it eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1 (k). In addition, please see section V (b) above. Impacts would not result.

- |                                                                              |                          |                                     |                          |                          |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.				

Tribal Cultural Resources include sites, features, places, cultural landscapes, and sacred places or objects that have cultural value or significance to a Native American Tribe. Tribal Cultural Resources include “non-unique archaeological resources” that, instead of being important for “scientific” value as a resource, can also be significant because of the sacred and/or cultural tribal value of the resource. Tribal representatives are considered experts appropriate for providing substantial evidence regarding the locations, types, and significance of tribal cultural resources within their traditionally and cultural affiliated geographic area (PRC § 21080.3.1(a)).

In accordance with the requirements of Public Resources Code 21080.3.1, the City of San Diego provided formal notifications to the Lipay Nation of Santa Ysabel, the Jamul Indian Village, and the San Pasqual Band of Mission Indians which are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area; requesting consultation on August 6, 2024. No responses were received during the 30-day consultation period.

It was determined that there are no sites, features, places or cultural landscapes that would be substantially adversely impacted by the proposed project. Although no Tribal Cultural Resources were identified within the project site, there is a potential for the construction of the project to impact buried and unknown Tribal Cultural Resources due to the presence of cultural resources in the project vicinity and poor surface visibility during the cultural resource surveys. Therefore, archaeological and Native American monitoring is included in the MMRP. Mitigation in the form of archaeological and Native American monitoring would reduce all impacts to Tribal Cultural Resources to below a level of significance. See section V of the MND and the Mitigation, Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for further details.

XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:

- |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which would cause significant environmental effects? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The project is not anticipated to generate significant amount of wastewater or stormwater. As discussed in VI (a), the project would not result in a significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources. Wastewater facilities used by the project would be operated in accordance with the applicable wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). Existing sewer infrastructure

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

exists within roadways surrounding the project site and adequate services are available to serve the project. Thus, impacts would be less than significant.

- |                                                                                                                                                           |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The 2020 City Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) serves as the water resources planning document for the City's residents, businesses, interest groups, and public officials. The UWMP assesses the current and future water supply and needs for the City. The 2020 UWMP emphasizes a cross functional, systems approach that is intended to better guide and integrate any subsequent water resources studies, facilities master planning, and various regulatory reporting and assessment activities at the City, regional and state levels beyond a basic profiling of the City's water system. (City of San Diego 2020). The project does not meet Senate Bill 610 requirements for the project to prepare a water supply assessment. Implementation of the project would not result in new or expanded water entitlements from the water service provider, as the project is consistent with existing demand projections contained in the UWMP (which are based on the allowed land uses for the project site). Therefore, the project would not require new or expanded entitlements. No impacts would result.

- |                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c) 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 demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The project would not adversely affect existing wastewater treatment services. Adequate services are available to serve the project site without requiring new or expanded entitlements. No impacts would result.

- |                                                                                                                                                                                         |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Construction debris and waste would be generated from the construction of the project. All construction waste from the project site would be transported to an appropriate facility, which would have sufficient permitted capacity to accept that generated by the project. Long-term operation of the residential use is anticipated to generate typical amounts of solid waste associated with residential uses. Furthermore, the project would be required to comply with the City's Municipal Code requirement for diversion of both construction waste during the short-term, construction phase and solid waste during the long-term, operational phase. Impacts are considered to be less than significant.

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The project would comply with all Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. The project would not result in the generation of large amounts of solid waste, nor generate or require the transport of hazardous waste materials, other than minimal amounts generated during the construction phase. All demolition activities would comply with any City of San Diego requirements for diversion of both construction waste during the demolition phase and solid waste during the long-term, operational phase. Impacts would be less than significant.

XX. WILDFIRE – If located in or near state responsibility area or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:

a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The City of San Diego participates in the San Diego County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan. The project complies with the General Plan and is consistent with the La Jolla Community Plan land use and the Land Development Code zoning designation. The project is located in an urbanized area of San Diego and construction of one single-family residence would not disrupt any emergency evacuation routes as identified in the Hazard Mitigation Plan. Therefore, the project would have a less-than-significant impact on an emergency response and evacuation plan during construction and operation.

b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of wildfire?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The project is located in a Very High Fire Severity Zone, in an urbanized neighborhood of similar residential development. The project is consistent with the zoning and land use designation pursuant to the La Jolla Community Plan and would be conditioned to comply with the City's Brush Management Regulations. The project would not have the potential to expose occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of wildfire. Therefore, impacts would remain below a level of significance.

c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

The project is located in a residential neighborhood with similar development. Existing utilities are available in the vicinity of the project site, which would service the site after construction is completed. No new construction of roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines, or other utilities would be constructed that would exacerbate fire risk. Impacts would be less than significant.

- |                                                                                                                                                                                         |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Refer to response XX (b) above. The project would comply with the City's appropriate Best Management Practices (BMP) for drainage and would not expose people or structures to significant risks as a result of run-off, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes. Therefore, a less than significant impact would result.

#### XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE –

- |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |                          |                                     |                          |                          |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

This analysis has determined that there are significant impacts related to Biological Resources, Cultural Resources (Archeology) and Tribal Cultural Resources. As such, mitigation measures included in this document would reduce these potential impacts to a less than significant level as outlined within the Mitigated Negative Declaration.

- |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |                          |                                     |                          |                          |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

As documented in this Initial Study, the project may have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, notably with respect to Biological Resources, Cultural Resources (Archeology) and Tribal Cultural Resources, which may have cumulatively considerable impacts. As such, mitigation

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

measures have been incorporated to reduce impacts to less than significant. Other future projects within the surrounding neighborhood or community would be required to comply with applicable local, State, and Federal regulations to reduce the potential impacts to less than significant, or to the extent possible. As such, the project is not anticipated to contribute potentially significant cumulative environmental impacts.

c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

As discussed throughout this document, it is not anticipated that construction activities would create conditions that would significantly directly or indirectly impact human beings. Where appropriate, mitigation measures have been required, but in all issue areas impacts are no impact, less than significant, or can be reduced to less than significant through mitigation. For this reason, environmental effects fall below the thresholds established by CEQA and the City of San Diego and therefore would not result in significant impacts. Impacts would be less than significant.

## INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST REFERENCES

### I. Aesthetics / Neighborhood Character

- ☒ City of San Diego General Plan
- ☒ Community Plans: La Jolla

### II. Agricultural Resources & Forest Resources

- ☒ City of San Diego General Plan
- ☐ U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Survey - San Diego Area, California, Part I and II, 1973
- ☐ California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997)
- ☐ Site Specific Report:

### III. Air Quality

- ☐ California Clean Air Act Guidelines (Indirect Source Control Programs) 1990
- ☒ Regional Air Quality Strategies (RAQS) - APCD
- ☐ Site Specific Report:

### IV. Biology

- ☒ City of San Diego, Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP), Subarea Plan, 1997
- ☒ City of San Diego, MSCP, "Vegetation Communities with Sensitive Species and Vernal Pools" Maps, 1996
- ☒ City of San Diego, MSCP, "Multiple Habitat Planning Area" maps, 1997
- ☐ Community Plan - Resource Element
- ☐ California Department of Fish and Game, California Natural Diversity Database, "State and Federally-listed Endangered, Threatened, and Rare Plants of California," January 2001
- ☐ California Department of Fish and Game, California Natural Diversity Database, "State and Federally-listed Endangered and Threatened Animals of California," January 2001
- ☐ City of San Diego Land Development Code Biology Guidelines
- ☒ Site Specific Report:
  - Biological Technical Report for the 2072 Via Casa Alta project prepared by Laguna Mountain Environmental, Inc., October 8, 2024.

### V. Cultural Resources (includes Historical Resources and Built Environment)

- ☒ City of San Diego Historical Resources Guidelines
- ☒ City of San Diego Archaeology Library
- ☒ Historical Resources Board List
- ☐ Community Historical Survey:
- ☒ Site Specific Report:
  - Archeological Report, for the 2072 Via Casa Alta project prepared by Laguna Mountain Environmental, Inc dated April 2024.

### VI. Energy

- ☒ City of San Diego Climate Action Plan (CAP), (City of San Diego 2022)
- ☐ City of San Diego Climate Action Plan Consistency Checklist –
- ☐ City of San Diego Climate Action Plan Consistency Regulations (SDMC 143.140)



**VII. Geology/Soils**

- ☒ City of San Diego Seismic Safety Study
- ☒ U.S. Department of Agriculture Soil Survey - San Diego Area, California, Part I and II, December 1973 and Part III, 1975
- ☒ City of San Diego Paleontological Guidelines
- ☐ Deméré, Thomas A., and Stephen L. Walsh, "Paleontological Resources City of San Diego," Department of Paleontology San Diego Natural History Museum, 1996
- ☒ Kennedy, Michael P., and Gary L. Peterson, "Geology of the San Diego Metropolitan Area, California. Del Mar, La Jolla, Point Loma, La Mesa, Poway, and SW 1/4 Escondido 7 1/2 Minute Quadrangles," *California Division of Mines and Geology Bulletin* 200, Sacramento, 1975
- ☐ Kennedy, Michael P., and Siang S. Tan, "Geology of National City, Imperial Beach and Otay Mesa Quadrangles, Southern San Diego Metropolitan Area, California," Map Sheet 29, 1977
- ☒ Site Specific Report: Report of Preliminary Geotechnical and Geologic Fault Investigation for the 2072 Via Casa Alta project prepared by Geotechnical Exploration, Inc. dated July 28 2022 and Addendum dated May 31 2023.

**VIII. Greenhouse Gas Emissions**

- ☒ City of San Diego Climate Action Plan (CAP), (City of San Diego 2022)
- ☐ Site Specific Report:

**IX. Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

- ☒ San Diego County Hazardous Materials Environmental Assessment Listing
- ☒ San Diego County Hazardous Materials Management Division
- ☐ FAA Determination
- ☒ State Assessment and Mitigation, Unauthorized Release Listing, Public Use Authorized
- ☐ Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan
- ☐ Site Specific Report:

**X. Hydrology/Drainage**

- ☐ Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM)
- ☒ Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), National Flood Insurance Program-Flood Boundary and Floodway Map
- ☐ Clean Water Act Section 303(b) list, [http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/tmdl/303d\\_lists.html](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/tmdl/303d_lists.html)
- ☒ Site Specific Report:
  - Hydrology & Drainage Report for the 2072 Via Casa Alta project prepared by Labib Funk + Associates, January 13, 2025
  - Priority Development Project (PDP) Stormwater Quality Management Plan (SWQMP) for the 2072 Via Casa Alta project prepared by Labib Funk + Associates, January 13, 2025

**XI. Land Use and Planning**

- ☒ City of San Diego General Plan

- ☒ Community Plan: La Jolla
- ☐ Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan
- ☒ City of San Diego Zoning Maps
- ☐ FAA Determination:
- ☐ Other Plans:

## **XII. Mineral Resources**

- ☒ California Department of Conservation - Division of Mines and Geology, Mineral Land Classification
- ☐ Division of Mines and Geology, Special Report 153 - Significant Resources Maps
- ☐ City of San Diego General Plan: Conservation Element
- ☐ Site Specific Report:

## **XIII. Noise**

- ☒ City of San Diego General Plan
- ☒ Community Plan: La Jolla
- ☐ San Diego International Airport - Lindbergh Field CNEL Maps
- ☐ Brown Field Airport Master Plan CNEL Maps
- ☐ Montgomery Field CNEL Maps
- ☐ San Diego Association of Governments - San Diego Regional Average Weekday Traffic Volumes
- ☐ San Diego Metropolitan Area Average Weekday Traffic Volume Maps, SANDAG
- ☐ Site Specific Report:

## **XIV. Population / Housing**

- ☒ City of San Diego General Plan
- ☒ Community Plan: La Jolla
- ☐ Series 11/Series 12 Population Forecasts, SANDAG
- ☐ Other:

## **XV. Public Services**

- ☒ City of San Diego General Plan
- ☒ Community Plan: La Jolla

## **XVI. Recreational Resources**

- ☒ City of San Diego General Plan
- ☒ Community Plan: La Jolla
- ☐ Department of Park and Recreation
- ☐ City of San Diego - San Diego Regional Bicycling Map
- ☐ Additional Resources:

## **XVII. Transportation / Circulation**

- ☒ City of San Diego General Plan
- ☒ Community Plan: La Jolla
- ☐ San Diego Metropolitan Area Average Weekday Traffic Volume Maps, SANDAG
- ☐ San Diego Region Weekday Traffic Volumes, SANDAG

- ☒ City of San Diego Transportation Study Manual (September 29, 2020)
- ☐ Site Specific Report:

**XVIII. Tribal Cultural Resources**

- ☒ City of San Diego Historical Resources Guidelines
- ☒ City of San Diego Archaeology Library
- ☒ Historical Resources Board List
- ☐ Community Historical Survey
- ☒ Site Specific Report: Cultural Resource Survey for the Javaheri Residence Project 2072 Via Casa Alta prepared by Laguna Mountain Environmental, Inc., July 2024.

**XIX. Utilities and Service Systems**

- ☒ City of San Diego General Plan
- ☒ Community Plan: La Jolla
- ☐ Site Specific Report:

**XX. Wildfire**

- ☒ City of San Diego General Plan
- ☒ Community Plan: La Jolla
- ☒ San Diego County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan
- ☒ Very High Fire Severity Zone Map, City of San Diego
- ☒ City of San Diego Brush Management Regulations, Landscape Regulations (SDMC 142.0412)
- ☐ Site Specific Report:

Revised: March 2025





## Location Map

2072 Via Casa Alta / Project No. PRJ-0698915  
 Development Services Department



Figure 1



