

**SECOND ADDENDUM
TO THE
FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (FEIR) FOR THE
SAN DIEGO DOWNTOWN COMMUNITY PLAN,
CENTRE CITY PLANNED DISTRICT ORDINANCE,
AND REDEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR THE
CENTRE CITY PROJECT AREA
(STATE CLEARINGHOUSE NUMBER 2003041001,
REVISED MARCH 2006)**

FOR THE PROPOSED

**AMENDMENTS TO THE
SAN DIEGO DOWNTOWN COMMUNITY PLAN,
CENTRE CITY PLANNED DISTRICT ORDINANCE,
MARINA PLANNED DISTRICT ORDINANCE, AND
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM**

September 2009

Prepared for: The Redevelopment Agency of
The City of San Diego
600 B St., Suite 400
San Diego, CA 92101

Preparation Administered by: Centre City Development Corporation
401 B Street, Suite 400
San Diego, CA 92101

Prepared by: EDAW AECOM
1420 Kettner Boulevard, Suite 500
San Diego, CA 92101

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
1.0 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Purpose	1
1.2 Background.....	1
1.3 CEQA Requirements	2
1.4 Previous Environmental Documents Incorporated by Reference	3
1.5 Project Description	3
1.6 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Explanation of the Decision not to Prepare a Supplemental or Subsequent EIR	7
1.7 Conclusion	8
2.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SECONDARY STUDY CHECKLIST	9
2.1 Aesthetics/Visual Quality	10
2.2 Agricultural Resources	13
2.3 Air Quality	13
2.4 Biological Resources	19
2.5 Historical Resources	20
2.6 Geology and Soils.....	23
2.7 Hazards & Hazardous Materials	24
2.8 Hydrology and Water Quality.....	26
2.9 Land Use and Planning	30
2.10 Mineral Resources	35
2.11 Noise	36
2.12 Population and Housing.....	39
2.13 Public Services & Utilities	40
2.14 Parks & Recreational Facilities.....	47
2.15 Transportation/Traffic.....	48
2.16 Mandatory Findings of Significance.....	52

Attachment A. Proposed Amendments to the 2006 FEIR MMRP

LIST OF FIGURES

<u>Figure</u>	<u>Page</u>
1 Regional Location and Vicinity	4

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This Addendum to the Downtown Community Plan Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) SCH No. 2003041001 prepared for the Redevelopment Agency of the City of San Diego has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15164. It updates the FEIR which was certified on February 28, 2006. The FEIR addresses the impacts of development of the entire Centre City Redevelopment Project Area and Downtown Community Plan area. The FEIR is available for review at the offices of the Centre City Development Corporation (CCDC), which are located at 401 B Street, Suite 400, San Diego, CA 92101.

1.1 PURPOSE

This Addendum has been prepared to evaluate the potential environmental effects of the proposed amendments to four documents that regulate land use and development in the Centre City area: the Downtown Community Plan, the Centre City Planned District Ordinance (PDO), the Marina Planned District Ordinance (PDO), and the 2006 Final Environmental Impact Report (Final EIR) Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP). Section 15164(a) of the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”) Guidelines provides that the lead agency shall prepare an addendum to a previously certified environmental impact report (“EIR”) if some changes or additions are necessary but none of the conditions described in CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162-15163 calling for preparation of a Supplemental or Subsequent EIR have occurred. This Addendum conclusively demonstrates that none of the conditions described in CEQA Guidelines Section 15162-15163 have occurred.

1.2 BACKGROUND

On February 28, 2006, the San Diego City Council adopted the Downtown Community Plan, the 10th Amendment to the Redevelopment Plan for the Centre City Redevelopment Project, and the Centre City Planned District Ordinance (PDO), the framework for downtown land development. At the time of adoption, it was anticipated that it would be necessary to amend these documents to make a variety of refinements based on the lessons learned in implementation of the new programs and policies. As such, these documents were amended in July of 2007 per the 11th Amendment to the Redevelopment Plan for the Centre City Redevelopment Project and Amendments to the Downtown Community Plan and Centre City PDO.

The amendments proposed as part of this project were originally considered in the 11th Amendment package. However, at the time the 11th Amendment package was adopted, the currently proposed amendments were omitted and continued for further consideration until now. CCDC has prepared this 2009 Addendum for these proposed Amendments to the Downtown Community Plan, Centre City Planned District Ordinance, Marina Planned District Ordinance, and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program of the FEIR (proposed project) to adequately document these modifications.

1.3 CEQA REQUIREMENTS

Pursuant to section 15164(a) of the CEQA Guidelines, the lead agency or a responsible agency shall prepare an Addendum to a previously certified EIR “if some changes or additions are necessary, but none of the conditions described in Sections 15162-15163 calling for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR have occurred”. These sections of the CEQA Guidelines would require a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR if any of the following conditions apply:

- Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;
- Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or
- New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete, shows any of the following:
 - The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR;
 - Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;
 - Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or
 - Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

In the event that none of the aforementioned conditions are met, Section 15164(a) states that a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR is not required. Rather, an agency can:

- Decide that no further environmental documentation is necessary; or
- Require that an addendum be prepared.

Based on the results of the Environmental Secondary Study Checklist prepared for the Amendments, none of the situations described in CEQA Sections 15162-15163 apply. Therefore, the decision was made to prepare an Addendum (see further discussion in Section 1.6).

1.4 PREVIOUS ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE

Consistent with Section 15150 of the CEQA Guidelines, the following documents were used in the Preparation of this Addendum and are incorporated herein by reference:


Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the San Diego Downtown Community Plan, Centre City Planned District Ordinance, and 10th Amendment to the Redevelopment Plan for the Centre City Project (State Clearinghouse Number 2003041001, certified by the Redevelopment Agency (Resolution No. R-04001) and the City Council (Resolution No. R-301265) on March 14, 2006.

Addendum to the FEIR for the 11th Amendment to the Redevelopment Plan for the Centre City Redevelopment Project, Amendments to the San Diego Downtown Community Plan, Centre City Planned District Ordinance, Marina Planned District Ordinance, and Mitigation, Monitoring and Reporting Program of the FEIR for the San Diego Downtown Community Plan, Centre City Planned District Ordinance, and the Redevelopment Plan for the Centre City Redevelopment Project certified by the Redevelopment Agency by Resolution R-04193 and by the City Council by R-302932 on July 31, 2007.

1.5 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Project Location

The Downtown Community Plan Area (Downtown Planning Area) includes approximately 1,500 acres of land in the metropolitan core of the City of San Diego, located in the southwest quadrant of San Diego County. The Downtown Planning Area is bounded by Laurel Street and Interstate 5 on the north; Interstate 5, Commercial Street, 16th Street, Sigsbee Street, Newton Avenue, Harbor Drive, and the extension of Beardsley Street on the east and southeast; and San Diego Bay on the south and west and southwest (Figure 1). Major north-south access routes to downtown are Interstate 5, State Route 163, and Pacific Highway. The major east-west access route to downtown is State Route 94. Surrounding areas include the community of Uptown and Balboa Park to the north, Golden Hill and Sherman Heights to the east, Barrio Logan and Logan Heights to the South, and the City of Coronado to the west across San Diego Bay.



Source: EDAW 2009



Figure 1
Regional Location and Vicinity

Three Planned District Ordinances (PDOs) serve as the zoning documents for downtown. PDOs contain regulations with respect to land use, intensity and density, building massing, sun access, architectural design, parking, open space, landscaping, and other development characteristics. The proposed project includes amendments to the Centre City and Marina PDOs. The boundaries of the Centre City and Marina PDO areas are depicted in Figure 1. The Centre City PDO applies to all of the Downtown Community Planning area with the exception of the Gaslamp Quarter, which is not part of the proposed project; the Marina Planned District; and, those lands controlled by other government agencies such as the San Diego Port District, the County of San Diego, the State of California, and the United States Government. The Marina Planned District is a 25-block area located between Pacific Highway, F Street, Union Street, G Street, Fourth Avenue, and Harbor Drive, with the exception of the eastern half of the block bounded by 3rd and 4th avenues, and Market and Island streets.

Proposed Project

The proposed project consists of amendments to four documents that regulate land use and development in the Downtown Planning Area: the Downtown Community Plan, the Centre City Planned District Ordinance (PDO), the Marina Planned District Ordinance (PDO), and the 2006 Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP).

The purpose of the proposed project is to facilitate better implementation of the policies set forth in the Downtown Community Plan by strengthening current language and creating consistency among related planning documents. The proposed amendments to the aforementioned regulatory documents primarily consist of 1) refining mitigation measure language related to historical, archeological, and paleontological resources in the FEIR MMRP; 2) amending the Downtown Community Plan for consistency with the PDO by including policy and text clarifications pertaining to historic preservation and by adding the modified and approved MMRP to the Downtown Community Plan as an Appendix; 3) amending the Centre City PDO by adding additional policies and regulations for historical resources and providing clarifying and edited language throughout the PDO; and 4) adding parking requirements in the Marina PDO to be consistent with those stated in the Centre City PDO.

Copies of the proposed amendments in ~~strikeout~~/underline are available for review in the offices of CCDC (amendments to the MMRP are included as an attachment to this Addendum). The amendments would apply to future projects proposed within the Downtown Community Plan area. As amended, the planning documents will form the basis for analyzing future projects. Pursuant to the Redevelopment Agency's Guidelines, an environmental secondary study will be conducted on specific projects to assess whether project level impacts are fully addressed within this Addendum and the previous environmental documents discussed in Section 1.4, or if further environmental review is required.

Proposed Amendments to the FEIR MMRP

Amendments to the 2006 FEIR MMRP include the revision of mitigation measures pertaining to historical resources and archeological resources. The refinements made to Mitigation Measures HIST-A.1, HIST-B.1, and PAL-A.1 in the MMRP reflect the current best practices for mitigating impacts to

these resources. As stated above, the revised MMRP will be added as an appendix to the Downtown Community Plan.

Proposed Amendments to the Downtown Community Plan

The proposed amendments to the Downtown Community Plan include text modifications and revisions primarily related to Historical Resources. The proposed amendments are summarized as follows:

1. Modifications and additions to the text in Chapter 3 – Land Use and Housing. These changes pertain to the Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) Program for historical resources. The language in this section has been amended to expand and facilitate the transfer of development rights from historical resources. Eligible sending and receiving sites may be located on the same block, or in colored areas shown in Figure 3-11 of the Downtown Community Plan. Transfers can take place either between two different parcels with the same owner, or between two willing and qualified owners as defined in the Centre City PDO. In addition, CCDC or the Agency may set up a “TDR Bank” or other mechanisms to facilitate transfers.
2. Modifications and additions to the text in Chapter 9 – Historic Preservation. These changes strengthen the policy language to be consistent with the City’s review process for historical resources.
3. The addition of an Appendix containing the revised MMRP from the 2006 FEIR.

Proposed Amendments to the Centre City PDO

The proposed amendments to the Centre City PDO pertain primarily to Historical Resources. The proposed modifications include changes and minor edits occur throughout the text for consistency with City’s nomenclature. The changes listed below are proposed to implement amended Downtown Community Plan language (policy and text modifications discussed above) and refine regulations including:

1. Historical Resources Reviews – Changes have been incorporated to strengthen language to conform to the City’s review process of historical resources.
2. Relocation Preference - Changes have been incorporated to establish preference for the relocation of historical resources in the downtown area when no feasible alternative to incorporate the historical resource in new development is possible.
3. Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) – Changes have been incorporated to allow for expanded opportunities for the transfer of development rights from historical resources in certain circumstances.

4. Uses Occupying Historical Resources – Changes include the addition of a new section allowing a wider range of conditions under which certain uses may occupy historical resources. This amendment would allow uses not typically allowed within a land use district to be located within historical buildings under a conditional use permit.

Proposed Amendments to the Marina PDO

Amendments to the Marina PDO are focused on Section §1511.0401: Parking and Off-Street Loading Regulations. This section has been revised to add the parking regulations adopted in 2006 within the 2006 Centre City PDO into the Marina PDO (amendments to the Gaslamp Quarter PDO currently are being processed separately). The old parking regulations (i.e., 0.5 spaces per residential unit) are still currently in effect in the Marina District. With this action, all three downtown Planned Districts (Centre City, Gaslamp Quarter, and Marina) will have consistent parking regulations.

1.6 SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND EXPLANATION OF THE DECISION NOT TO PREPARE A SUPPLEMENTAL OR SUBSEQUENT EIR

Based on the analysis in the Environmental Secondary Study Checklist (see Section 2.0) prepared as part of this Addendum, the proposed amendments would not result in any new significant impacts not discussed in the FEIR, or result in any substantial increases in the severity of impacts identified by the FEIR. In addition, no new information of substantial importance has become available since the FEIR was prepared regarding new significant impacts, or feasibility of mitigation measures or alternatives.

As discussed in Section 2.15, the parking requirements of the Marina PDO would be amended to be consistent with the parking requirements set forth in the Centre City PDO, which were analyzed in the 2006 FEIR. The FEIR concludes that the total parking demand generated by downtown development would exceed the amount of parking provided by such development subject to the parking requirements of the Centre City PDO. As stated in the FEIR, the Centre City parking ratios would contribute to the cumulatively significant and unmitigable parking shortage in the Downtown Planning Area. The Agency and the City Council of the City of San Diego adopted a Statements of Overriding Considerations in regard to those impacts. This amendment to the Marina PDO to increase parking ratios within the Marina Planned District would not result in new significant impacts not previously discussed in the FEIR, nor would they result in an increase in the severity of the previously identified impacts.

Therefore, none of the situations described in CEQA Sections 15162-15163 applies. Neither the proposed revisions nor the circumstances under which they are being undertaken would result in any new significant impacts not discussed in the FEIR, or any substantial increase in the severity of impacts identified by the FEIR. In addition, no new information of substantial importance has become available since the FEIR was prepared regarding new significant impacts, or feasibility of mitigation measures or alternatives. Therefore, the proposed amendments are adequately addressed in the FEIR and the 2007 Addendum to the FEIR.

1.7 CONCLUSION

In summary, the analysis concludes that none of the conditions described in Sections 15162-15163 of the CEQA Guidelines requiring preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR have occurred. Thus, this Addendum to the Downtown Community Plan FEIR has been prepared in accordance with section 15164 of the CEQA Guidelines. The proposed amendments to the Downtown Community Plan, Centre City and Marina PDOs, and the FEIR MMRP do not introduce new significant environmental effects, increase previously identified significant effects, make previously infeasible mitigation measures or alternatives feasible, or require adoption of infeasible mitigation measures or alternatives.

2.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SECONDARY STUDY CHECKLIST

This section includes an Environmental Secondary Study Checklist that evaluates the potential environmental effects of the proposed project consistent with the significance thresholds and analysis methods contained in the FEIR. The checklist indicates how the impacts of the proposed amendments relate to the conclusions of the previous environmental documents. As a result, the impacts are classified into one of the following categories:

- Significant and Not Mitigated (SNM)
- Significant but Mitigated (SM)
- Not Significant (NS)

The checklist identifies each potential environmental effect and provides information supporting the conclusion drawn as to the degree of impact associated with the proposed project. The proposed amendments, as described in Section 1.5 (Project Description), would facilitate more efficient implementation of the policies set forth in the Downtown Community Plan and would create consistency among the related planning documents. These amendments would not change the established and intended character of the Downtown Planning Area as envisioned by the approved planning documents, including the FEIR. Furthermore, these amendments would not change the intensity of development established in the Downtown Community Plan and analyzed in the FEIR.

Therefore, the majority of the environmental analysis completed in the following checklist focuses on the modification to the TDR Program for historical resources and the adoption of parking standards for Marina PDO since the potential for these changes to result in environmental impacts was not fully covered in the FEIR. However, other proposed text revisions are also discussed where applicable.

Because the approval of the proposed project does not coincide with a specific development project or identify the timing of development projects that may be implemented, future environmental review of specific development projects with the potential for physical impacts will be required pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) at the time when they are proposed.

Issues and Supporting Information	Significant And Not Mitigated (SNM)		Significant But Mitigated (SM)		Not Significant (NS)	
	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)
2.1 AESTHETICS/VISUAL QUALITY:						
<p>(a) Substantially disturb a scenic resource, vista, or view from a public viewing area, including a State scenic highway or view corridor designated by the Community Plan?</p> <p>According to the FEIR, views of scenic resources such as San Diego Bay, San Diego-Coronado Bay Bridge, Point Loma, Coronado and the downtown skyline are afforded by public viewing areas within and around downtown, and along view corridor streets within the planning area. Several view corridor streets are identified in the Downtown Community Plan, including: Broadway from Park Boulevard west to the Bay; Park Boulevard from K Street to the Bay; and portions of the majority of the east – west streets from Kettner Street west to the Bay. In addition, Cedar Street begins as a view corridor street from 1st Avenue while Beech and Ash Streets begin as view corridor streets from 6th Avenue. The FEIR concludes that build-out of the Downtown Planning Area would not significantly impact these designated view corridors, and the Centre City PDO establishes view corridor setbacks on specific streets to maintain views and avoid impacts of future development.</p> <p>Additionally, the FEIR concludes that there no designated scenic resources within the Downtown Planning Area except for a small portion of State Designated Scenic Highway 163, as it enters the downtown. However, the majority of this designated Highway segment is not visible from the Downtown Planning Area.</p>					X	X

Issues and Supporting Information	Significant And Not Mitigated (SNM)		Significant But Mitigated (SM)		Not Significant (NS)	
	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)
<p>The proposed amendments do not include any components that would substantially disturb the existing visual character of the Downtown Planning Area, including the designated view corridors and the small portion of the State Designated Scenic Highway 163. In addition, the proposed amendments do not include modifications that would allow greater intensity of development other than that which is assumed in the FEIR. While the modifications to the language in the Downtown Community Plan and Centre City PDO related to the TDR from historical resources would expand opportunities for future transfers, these revisions do not include any changes to the allowable Floor Area Ratio (FAR) or bulk regulations set forth in the PDO or the Downtown Community Plan. Future proposed projects would still be required to adhere to all policies pertaining to scenic resources and view corridor setbacks. As such, the proposed amendments would not result in direct or cumulative impacts on the scenic resources of the Downtown Planning Area.</p>						

Issues and Supporting Information	Significant And Not Mitigated (SNM)		Significant But Mitigated (SM)		Not Significant (NS)	
	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)
<p>(b) Substantially incompatible with the bulk, scale, color and/or design of surrounding development? The proposed amendments do not include any components that would result in the development of structures that would be substantially incompatible with the bulk, scale, color and/or design of surrounding development within the Downtown Planning Area. While the modifications to the language in the Downtown Community Plan and Centre City PDO related to the TDR from historical resources would expand opportunities for future transfers, these revisions do not include any changes to the allowable Floor Area Ratio (FAR), bulk regulations, or design standards and guidelines set forth in the PDO or the Downtown Community Plan. Future proposed projects would still be required to adhere to all design standards and guidelines, and would also be subject to the Design Review process. Therefore, the proposed amendments would not result in direct and cumulative visual impacts on surrounding development, consistent with the conclusions of the FEIR.</p>					X	X
<p>(c) Substantially affect daytime or nighttime views in the area due to lighting? The City's Light Pollution Law (Municipal Code Section 101.1300 et seq.) protects nighttime views (e.g., astronomical activities) and light-sensitive land uses from excessive light generated by development in the downtown area. All future development would be subject to the City's Light Pollution Law, and would also be required to comply with the regulations set forth in the FEIR and the PDO. The proposed amendments do not</p>					X	X

Issues and Supporting Information	Significant And Not Mitigated (SNM)		Significant But Mitigated (SM)		Not Significant (NS)	
	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)
include changes to lighting policies or regulations. Therefore, the direct and cumulative impacts to daytime and nighttime views due to lighting would not be significant, consistent with the findings of the FEIR.						
2.2 AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES						
(a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland) to non-agricultural use? Centre City is an urban downtown environment that does not contain land designated as prime agricultural soils by the Soils Conservation Service, nor does it contain prime farmlands designated by the California Department of Conservation. Therefore, no direct or cumulative significant impact to agricultural resources would occur.					X	X
(b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? The downtown area does not contain, nor is it near, land zoned for agricultural use or land subject to a Williamson Act contract pursuant to Section 51201 of the California Government Code. Therefore, significant direct or cumulative impacts to land zoned for agricultural use or land subject to a Williamson Act contract lands would not occur.					X	X
2.3 AIR QUALITY						
(a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of an applicable air quality plan, including the County's Regional Air Quality Strategies or the State Implementation Plan? The					X	X

Issues and Supporting Information	Significant And Not Mitigated (SNM)		Significant But Mitigated (SM)		Not Significant (NS)	
	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)
<p>Downtown Planning Area is located within the San Diego Air Basin, which is under the jurisdiction of the San Diego Air Pollution Control District (SDAPCD). The San Diego Air Basin is designated by state and federal air quality standards as nonattainment for ozone and particulate matter (PM) less than 10 microns (PM₁₀) and less than 2.5 microns (PM_{2.5}) in equivalent diameter. The SDAPCD has developed a Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) to attain the state air quality standards for ozone. According to the FEIR, development pursuant to the Downtown Community Plan would not conflict with regional air quality planning, and would be consistent with the RAQS.</p> <p>The proposed amendments do not include modifications that would allow for different intensity of development within the Downtown Planning Area other than those assumed in the FEIR. Therefore, no significant direct or cumulative impacts to an applicable air quality plan would occur.</p>						
<p>(b) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial air contaminants including, but not limited to, criteria pollutants, smoke, soot, grime, toxic fumes and substances, particulate matter, or any other emissions that may endanger human health? The FEIR concludes that construction activities associated with future development in the Downtown Planning Area could expose sensitive receptors to substantial emissions of particulate matter and requires implementation of mitigation</p>					X	X

Issues and Supporting Information	Significant And Not Mitigated (SNM)		Significant But Mitigated (SM)		Not Significant (NS)	
	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)
<p>measures at the project-level to reduce these impacts to a less than significant level.</p> <p>The proposed amendments do not include modifications that would allow for greater intensity of development other than that which has been previously assumed in the FEIR. In addition, all future development subject to the proposed amendments would be reviewed for conformance with the FEIR and the Addendum hereto. Therefore, the proposed amendments would not result in significant direct or cumulative impacts greater than those assumed in the FEIR.</p>						
<p>(c) Generate substantial air contaminants including, but not limited to, criteria pollutants, smoke, soot, grime, toxic fumes and substances, PM, or any other emissions that may endanger human health? The FEIR concludes that construction activities associated with future development in the Downtown Planning Area could result in the generation of substantial emissions of particulate matter and requires implementation of mitigation measures at the project-level to reduce these impacts to a less than significant level.</p> <p>The proposed amendments do not include modifications that would allow for greater intensity of development other than that which has been previously assumed in the FEIR. In addition, all future development subject to the proposed amendments would be reviewed for conformance with the FEIR and the Addendum hereto. Therefore, the proposed amendments would not result in significant direct or cumulative impacts</p>					X	X

Issues and Supporting Information	Significant And Not Mitigated (SNM)		Significant But Mitigated (SM)		Not Significant (NS)	
	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)
greater than those assumed in the FEIR.						
2.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES						
(a) Substantially effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by local, state, or federal agencies? Due to the highly urbanized nature of the downtown area, there are no sensitive plant or animal species, habitats, or wildlife migration corridors within the area. In addition, the ornamental trees and landscaping included in the proposed project are considered of insignificant value to native wildlife in their proposed location. Therefore, no significant direct or cumulative impact associated with this issue is anticipated to occur.					X	X
(b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations by local, state, or federal agencies? The proposed amendments do not include policies or regulations that would alter the conclusions of the FEIR. As identified in the FEIR, the Downtown Planning Area is not within a subregion of the San Diego County Multiple Species Conservation Program, and does not contain any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations by local, state, or federal agencies. Therefore, significant direct or cumulative impacts associated with					X	X

Issues and Supporting Information	Significant And Not Mitigated (SNM)		Significant But Mitigated (SM)		Not Significant (NS)	
	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)
substantial adverse effects on riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities would not occur as a result of the implementation of the proposed amendments.						
2.5 HISTORICAL RESOURCES						
<p>(a) Substantially impact a significant historical resource, as defined in § 15064.5? According to the conclusions stated in the FEIR, compliance with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards and Guidelines would reduce potentially significant impacts to National Register-listed/eligible or California Register-listed/eligible historical structures to a level less than significant. However, the FEIR also concludes that future development pursuant to the Downtown Community Plan may result in the substantial alteration, relocation, or possible demolition of locally designated (San Diego Register listed) historical resources. To reduce potential impacts associated with the relocation of locally designated historic resources, the FEIR includes Mitigation Measure HIST A.1-3; however, it is considered speculative to determine whether this mitigation measure would be able to reduce impacts to those resources to a level less than significant. Therefore, the FEIR concludes that impacts to locally designated historical resources would be significant and unmitigated.</p> <p>In an effort to reduce these potential significant and unmitigated impacts to locally designated and eligible historical resources, the proposed amendments include refinements to the existing</p>					X	X

Issues and Supporting Information	Significant And Not Mitigated (SNM)		Significant But Mitigated (SM)		Not Significant (NS)	
	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)
<p>mitigation measures in the FEIR MMRP related to historical, archeological, and paleontological resources; clarification of language regarding proposed alterations to historical resources to be consistent with Citywide regulations; the consideration of relocation for all historical resources proposed to be demolished; the potential expansion of the TDR from historical resources; and the addition of a wider range of conditions under which certain uses may occupy historical buildings.</p> <p>The addition of language to the MMRP for the FEIR seeks to clarify necessary best management practices to be followed when a proposed development could affect an archaeological or historical resource. Additional revisions focus on incorporating strengthened language to conform to the City’s review process for historical resources. In an attempt to avoid the demolition of historical resources, the PDO would be revised to include language that would first seek to relocate the resource within the Centre City Planned District, if feasible. These proposed revisions would help to ensure that potential impacts to historical resources would be reduced to less than significant levels or avoided completely.</p> <p>Additional revisions to the Downtown Community Plan and Centre City PDO would clarify when and how development rights could be transferred from sites containing historical resources. The ability to transfer development</p>						

Issues and Supporting Information	Significant And Not Mitigated (SNM)		Significant But Mitigated (SM)		Not Significant (NS)	
	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)
<p>rights already exists within the Downtown Planning Area and the amendments seek to expand the potential for such transfers to facilitate the preservation and rehabilitation of structures of historic merit that contribute to the quality of the urban environment.</p> <p>Finally, the addition of language in the Centre City PDO would more clearly define the conditions under which certain uses may occupy historical buildings. This additional language specifies that historical buildings occupied by uses not otherwise allowed in certain land use districts may be permitted through issuance of a Conditional Use Permit. This would not allow for greater intensity of development to occur, other than that which is analyzed in the FEIR. In addition, this modification would further support the preservation, restoration, rehabilitation, and maintenance of historical buildings by allowing compatible uses consistent with the purpose for which the building was originally designed to occur.</p> <p>Therefore, the proposed amendments would serve to reduce potential impacts through the strengthening of the review and construction monitoring processes, the allowance for relocation of historic resources within downtown, and the expansion of TDR's and permitted uses which all serve to encourage the preservation of existing resources. As such, the proposed amendments would not result in direct or cumulative impacts related to historical resources,</p>						

Issues and Supporting Information	Significant And Not Mitigated (SNM)		Significant But Mitigated (SM)		Not Significant (NS)	
	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)
and would, in fact, lessen those assumed in the FEIR						
(b) Substantially impact a significant archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5, including the disturbance of human remains interred outside of formal cemeteries? The proposed amendments to the FEIR MMRP would strengthen the protection of archaeological resources by strengthening mitigation requirements for archaeological resources so that they are consistent with existing City regulations and policies. As proposed, this amendment does not include changes with a potential to adversely affect significant archaeological resources; rather, they expand protective measures for archaeological resources. Therefore, there are no potential direct or cumulative impacts related to this issue. The amendments to the MMRP expand protective measures for archaeological resources.					X	X
(c) Substantially impact a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? The proposed amendments expand protective measures for paleontological resources and do not include changes with the potential to adversely affect paleontological resources. Therefore, impacts are not significant. . The amendments to the MMRP expand protective measures for paleontological resources.					X	X
2.6 GEOLOGY AND SOILS						
(a) Substantial health and safety risk associated with seismic or geologic hazards? Since the Downtown Planning Area is located in					X	X

Issues and Supporting Information	Significant And Not Mitigated (SNM)		Significant But Mitigated (SM)		Not Significant (NS)	
	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)
<p>a seismically active region, a seismic event could cause significant seismic groundshaking within the downtown area. However, the FEIR indicates that conformance with, and implementation of, all seismic-safety development requirements, including City requirements for the Downtown Special Fault Zone, the seismic design requirements of the Uniform Building Code (UBC), the City of San Diego Notification of Geologic Hazard procedures, and all other applicable requirements would ensure that the potential impacts associated with seismic and geologic hazards in the Downtown Planning Area are not significant.</p> <p>Since the proposed amendments would not significantly alter the type or level of development allowed, nor impede conformance with, or implementation of, the abovementioned seismic safety development requirements, the impacts of the proposed amendments would be consistent with the conclusions assumed in the FEIR, and no potential direct or cumulative impacts related to this issue are anticipated.</p>						
2.7 HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS						
<p>(a) Substantial health and safety risk related to on-site hazardous materials? The proposed amendments do not include modifications that would allow for different intensity of development other than those assumed in the FEIR, nor would they implement any changes that involve the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials within the</p>					X	X

Issues and Supporting Information	Significant And Not Mitigated (SNM)		Significant But Mitigated (SM)		Not Significant (NS)	
	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)
Downtown Planning Area. Therefore, no direct or cumulative impacts associated with this issue are expected to occur.						
<p>(b) Be located on or within 2,000 feet of a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code §65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? The proposed amendments do not include policies or regulations that would alter the conclusions of the FEIR. According to the FEIR, the Downtown Planning Area contains one site, the Tow Basin Facility, on the State of California Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites List. Additionally, there are several sites on the County of San Diego's Site Assessment Mitigation (SAM) Case Listing that are located in the Downtown Planning Area. However, the FEIR concludes that compliance with existing mandatory federal, state, and local regulations would ensure that significant hazards to public and the environment do not occur. Since the proposed amendments do not include modifications that would allow for different intensity of development other than those assumed in the FEIR, nor include components that would in any way violate or impede adherence to the existing mandatory regulations, impacts related to the creation of significant hazards to the public or the environment would not be significant, consistent with the analysis of the FEIR. Therefore, there are no potential direct or cumulative impacts related to this issue.</p>					X	X

Issues and Supporting Information	Significant And Not Mitigated (SNM)		Significant But Mitigated (SM)		Not Significant (NS)	
	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)
<p>(c) Substantial safety risk to operations at San Diego International Airport? According to the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan for San Diego International Airport (SDIA), the entire Downtown Planning Area is located within the SDIS Airport Influence Area. The FEIR identifies policies that regulate development within areas affected by Lindbergh Field including building heights, use and intensity limitations, and noise sensitive uses. Since the proposed amendments do not include modifications that would allow for different intensity of development other than those assumed in the FEIR, nor include components that would in any way violate or impede adherence to these policies, impacts related to the creation of substantial safety risks at San Diego International Airport would not be significant, consistent with the analysis in the FEIR. Therefore, there are no potential direct or cumulative impacts related to this issue.</p>					X	X
<p>(d) Substantially impair implementation of an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? The FEIR concludes that development that occurs in accordance with the Downtown Community Plan would not adversely affect implementation of the City of San Diego's Emergency Operations Plan. The proposed amendments do not propose any features that would affect an emergency response or evacuation plan or alter the findings of the 2006 FEIR. Therefore, implementation of the proposed amendments is not anticipated to result in substantial impairment of an adopted emergency plan or an emergency evacuation</p>					X	X

Issues and Supporting Information	Significant And Not Mitigated (SNM)		Significant But Mitigated (SM)		Not Significant (NS)	
	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)
plan. Therefore, there are no potential direct or cumulative impacts related to this issue.						
2.8 HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY						
<p>(a) Substantially degrade groundwater or surface water quality? According to the FEIR, adherence to existing State and local water quality controls would ensure that the urban runoff generated by new development within the Downtown Community Plan area would not degrade groundwater or surface water quality. However, the FEIR concluded that the water quality of San Diego Bay is already impacted, and the addition of any pollutants in urban runoff discharged to the Bay would result in a cumulatively significant impact. While the modifications to the language in the Downtown Community Plan and Centre City PDO related to the TDR from historical resources would expand opportunities for future transfers, these revisions would not allow for greater intensity of development other than that which is assumed in the FEIR. Future proposed projects subject to the proposed amendments would still be required to adhere to all policies pertaining to groundwater and surface water quality. Therefore, no significant direct or cumulative impacts associated with this issue area have been identified.</p>					X	X
<p>(b) Substantially increase impervious surfaces and associated runoff flow rates or volumes? The proposed amendments do not include policies or regulations that would alter the conclusions of the FEIR. The FEIR concludes that development</p>					X	X

Issues and Supporting Information	Significant And Not Mitigated (SNM)		Significant But Mitigated (SM)		Not Significant (NS)	
	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)
under the Downtown Community Plan would not substantially increase impervious surfaces and associated runoff flow rates or volumes. Since the proposed amendments do not include components that would substantially increase impervious surfaces beyond the level assumed by the FEIR, impacts associated with increased runoff flow water or volumes would not be significant, consistent with the analysis of the FEIR. Impacts associated with the quality of urban runoff are analyzed in Section 8(a).						
(c) Substantially impede or redirect flows within a 100-year flood hazard area? The Downtown Planning Area is not located within a 100-year floodplain. Similarly, the proposed amendments would also not affect off-site flood hazard areas, as no 100-year floodplains are located downstream. Therefore, direct or cumulative impacts associated with these issues are not significant.					X	X
(d) Substantially increase erosion and sedimentation? The hydrology of the Downtown Planning Area would not be substantially altered over the long term by implementation of the proposed amendments as they would not allow for greater intensity of development other than that which is assumed in the FEIR. As such, planning area would maintain a similar quantity of impervious surfaces as currently exists. However, the FEIR indicates that the potential for erosion and sedimentation could increase during any short-term site preparation, excavation and other construction activities and concludes that the mandatory preparation and implementation of					X	X

Issues and Supporting Information	Significant And Not Mitigated (SNM)		Significant But Mitigated (SM)		Not Significant (NS)	
	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)
a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) would ensure that short-term impacts associated with erosion and sedimentation are not significant. Since the proposed amendments do not include components that would in any way impede preparation and implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), impacts associated with erosion and sedimentation are not significant. Therefore, no direct or cumulative significant impacts associated with this issue would occur.						
2.9 LAND USE AND PLANNING						
<p>(a) Physically divide an established community? As described in the project description, the majority of the proposed amendments would clarify existing language and facilitate more efficient implementation of the policies set forth in the Downtown Community Plan, as well as create consistency among the related planning documents for downtown. The majority of these amendments do not have the ability to divide an established community.</p> <p>The proposed amendments do include modifications to existing policy language that would allow for the consideration of relocation of historical resources proposed for demolition, the potential expansion of the TDR program for historical resources, and may allow a project protecting historic resources to establish uses through a CUP process that are not allowed under the current regulations. However, none of these modifications would result in the development of</p>					X	X

Issues and Supporting Information	Significant And Not Mitigated (SNM)		Significant But Mitigated (SM)		Not Significant (NS)	
	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)
uses, facilities or infrastructure that would disrupt or divide an established community. There would be no changes related to zoning, and the proposed amendments would not allow for greater intensity of development other than that which is assumed in the FEIR. Therefore, no significant direct or cumulative impacts associated with this issue would occur.						
<p>(b) Substantially conflict with the City’s General Plan and Progress Guide, Downtown Community Plan, Centre City PDO or other applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation?</p> <p>While the project proposes changes to the Downtown Community Plan, Centre City and Marina PDOs, and the FEIR MMRP, the majority of the proposed amendments are ‘clean-up’ in nature or have been proposed to clarify language and would not result in conflicts with existing applicable plans. Further, as described in the project description, the purpose of the proposed amendments is to create better consistency among these current planning documents that regulate development in the Downtown Planning Area.</p> <p>Since the initial approval of these plans, necessary ‘clean-up’ items, refinements to policy language, and other issues have arisen necessitating the proposed amendments. The appropriate format to implement these changes is through amendments to the applicable planning documents and review of the potential environmental impacts associated with those amendments. Specifically, the proposed amendments include 1) refining mitigation</p>					X	X

Issues and Supporting Information	Significant And Not Mitigated (SNM)		Significant But Mitigated (SM)		Not Significant (NS)	
	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)
<p>measure language related to historical, archeological, and paleontological resources in the FEIR MMRP; 2) amending the Downtown Community Plan for consistency with the PDO by including policy and text clarifications pertaining to historic preservation and by adding the modified and approved MMRP to the Downtown Community Plan as an Appendix; 3) amending the Centre City PDO by adding additional policies and regulations for historical resources and providing clarifying and edited language throughout the PDO; and 4) adding parking requirements in the Marina PDO to be consistent with those stated in the Centre City PDO.</p> <p>By their nature, the proposed amendments include several components that differ from existing applicable land use plans, policies or regulations. However, the proposed amendments would not allow for greater intensity of development other than that which is assumed in the FEIR, and would not result in significant environmental impacts beyond those identified in the FEIR. Therefore, no direct or cumulative impacts related to this issue would occur.</p>						
<p>(c) Substantial incompatibility with surrounding land uses? The proposed amendments do not include modifications that would allow for greater intensity of development other than that which is assumed in the FEIR.</p> <p>The proposed amendments would also allow for expanded opportunities of TDR from historical resources to eligible receiving sites as defined in</p>					X	X

Issues and Supporting Information	Significant And Not Mitigated (SNM)		Significant But Mitigated (SM)		Not Significant (NS)	
	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)
<p>the Centre City PDO. However, this amendment would not allow for greater intensity of development on the eligible receiving sites other than that which is assumed in the FEIR. Any future proposed development on an eligible receiving site would be required to adhere to all polices and land use regulations set forth in the Downtown Community Plan and PDO.</p> <p>The proposed amendments also include specific language that would allow a project protecting historic building/resource to establish uses through a CUP process that are not allowed under the current regulations, provided the project meets certain criteria within the Land Development Code, described below. This amendment would require that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The subject building be designated as a historical resource by the City of San Diego Historical Resources Board before approval of the Conditional Use Permit; 2. The use of the building shall be compatible with the uses in the surrounding area or shall be consistent with the purpose for which the building was originally designed; 3. The site shall be maintained in, or restored to, its original historical appearance, in accordance with Chapter 14, Article 3, Division 2 (Historical Resource Regulations) of the San Diego Municipal 						

Issues and Supporting Information	Significant And Not Mitigated (SNM)		Significant But Mitigated (SM)		Not Significant (NS)	
	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)
<p>Code; and</p> <p>4. Any facilities that are constructed as part of the new use shall be designed to be similar in scale and style with the historical use, in accordance with Chapter 14, Article 3, Division 2 (Historical Resource Regulations) of the San Diego Municipal Code.</p> <p>The inclusion of the above-listed regulations would ensure that the use not previously allowed would not result in incompatibilities with surrounding land uses or historic resources. As a whole, the proposed amendments would not result in direct or cumulative impacts associated with land use incompatibilities.</p>						
<p>(d) Substantially impact surrounding communities due to sanitation and litter problems generated by transients displaced by downtown development? The FEIR concludes that redevelopment activities pursuant to buildout in accordance with the Downtown Community Plan would have a significant cumulative impact on surrounding communities resulting from sanitation problems and litter generated by transients who are displaced from downtown into surrounding canyons and vacant land.</p> <p>As described in the project description, the majority of the proposed amendments include clarifications and strengthening of policy language related to historical and archeological resources. In addition, the proposed amendments</p>					X	X

Issues and Supporting Information	Significant And Not Mitigated (SNM)		Significant But Mitigated (SM)		Not Significant (NS)	
	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)
would not include modifications that would allow for greater intensity of development other than that which is assumed in the FEIR. Further, no specific project with the potential for physical impacts related to sanitation and litter problems generated by displaced transients is proposed at this time. As such, no specific impacts can be determined. Pursuant to Section 15145 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), analysis of the physical changes in the Downtown Planning Area which may occur from the proposed project would be speculative and no further analysis of their impacts is required.						
2.10 MINERAL RESOURCES						
(a) Substantially reduce the availability of important mineral resources? The proposed amendments do not include policies or regulations that would alter the conclusions of the FEIR. The FEIR concludes that the viable extraction of mineral resources is limited in the Downtown Planning Area due to its urbanized nature and the fact that the area is not designated as having high mineral resource potential. Therefore, no impact associated with this issue would occur.					X	X
2.11 NOISE						
(a) Substantial noise generation? The FEIR indicates that development within the Downtown Planning Area could generate both temporary noise impacts caused by construction activities and long-term noise impacts caused by entertainment and industrial sources. The FEIR concludes that adherence to existing sections of the City of San Diego Municipal Code at the individual project					X	X

Issues and Supporting Information	Significant And Not Mitigated (SNM)		Significant But Mitigated (SM)		Not Significant (NS)	
	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)
<p>level would ensure that noise impacts caused by construction activities are not significant. Since the proposed amendments do not include any regulations or measures that would in any way violate or obstruct implementation of the applicable sections of the City of San Diego Municipal Code and would subject to the Municipal Code, the impacts of the amendments would not be significant, consistent with the analysis of the FEIR.</p> <p>However, the FEIR concludes that build-out of downtown would result in substantial traffic noise increases on several street segments. The FEIR concludes that there are no feasible mitigation measures available to reduce the significant increase in noise on affected roadways and this impact remains significant and unavoidable.</p> <p>As summarized in the project description, the majority of the proposed amendments would clarify existing language and facilitate more efficient implementation of the policies set forth in the Downtown Community Plan, as well as create consistency among the related planning documents for downtown. In addition, the proposed amendments do not include modifications that would allow for greater intensity of development other than that which is assumed in the FEIR. Therefore, no significant direct or cumulative impacts associated with this issue area have been identified.</p>						

Issues and Supporting Information	Significant And Not Mitigated (SNM)		Significant But Mitigated (SM)		Not Significant (NS)	
	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)
<p>(b) Substantial exposure of required outdoor residential open spaces or public parks and plazas to noise levels (e.g., exposure to levels exceeding 65 dBA CNEL)? Future development and redevelopment subject to the proposed amendments would still be required to adhere to the existing requirements for residential open spaces and plazas. The FEIR indicates that exterior traffic noise in public parks and plazas is a significant impact and requires mitigation at the project level to help reduce this impact; however, impacts would not be fully mitigated. Since no project proposing outdoor residential open space or public parks and plazas pursuant to the proposed amendments is being analyzed at this time, mitigation is therefore not currently a requirement of the proposed action. Therefore, no significant direct or cumulative impacts associated with this issue area have been identified.</p>					X	X
<p>(c) Substantial interior noise within habitable rooms (e.g., levels in excess of 45 dBA CNEL)? The FEIR states that traffic noise levels in excess of 65 dB (A) could result in substantial interior noise within habitable rooms. The FEIR recognizes that noise levels on several street segments in the Downtown Planning Area would exceed 65 dB (A) CNEL and could expose habitable rooms facing these streets to levels in excess of 45 dB (A) CNEL (the interior standard required by California Code of Regulations, Title 24). The FEIR identifies this as a potentially significant impact and requires mitigation at the project level to reduce this impact below a level of significance.</p>					X	X

Issues and Supporting Information	Significant And Not Mitigated (SNM)		Significant But Mitigated (SM)		Not Significant (NS)	
	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)
As described in the project description, the proposed amendments would not allow for greater intensity of development other than that which is assumed in the FEIR. As such, the proposed amendments are not expected to result in a substantial increase in traffic or residential units above that analyzed in the FEIR. Therefore the impacts to interior noise levels in habitable rooms would be similar to those concluded in the FEIR. Since no project proposing habitable rooms pursuant to the proposed amendments is being analyzed at this time, mitigation is therefore not currently a requirement of the proposed action. Therefore, no significant direct or cumulative impacts associated with this issue area have been identified.						
2.12 POPULATION AND HOUSING						
(a) Substantially induce population growth in an area? The FEIR concludes that build-out of the Downtown Community Plan under the existing PDO would not induce substantial population growth that results in adverse physical changes. The proposed amendments do not include modifications that would allow for greater intensity of development other than that which is assumed in the FEIR, nor would they include changes that would affect the housing stock in the Downtown Planning Area. Therefore, the proposed amendments would not induce substantial population growth that would result in adverse physical changes beyond the level assumed in the FEIR and no direct or cumulative impacts associated with this issue would occur.					X	X

Issues and Supporting Information	Significant And Not Mitigated (SNM)		Significant But Mitigated (SM)		Not Significant (NS)	
	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)
(b) Substantial displacement of existing housing units or people? The proposed amendments do not include policies or regulations that could result in the substantial displacement of existing housing units or people. Therefore, displacement of housing units and/or persons would not occur as a result of the proposed amendments, and the construction of replacement housing would not be required. Direct and cumulative impacts associated with this issue would not occur.					X	X
2.13 PUBLIC SERVICES & UTILITIES:						
(a) Substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new schools? The proposed amendments do not include policies or regulations that would alter the conclusions of the FEIR, nor propose construction of any housing units or changes that would generate students and contribute to the need for schools in the Downtown Planning Area; therefore, no significant direct or cumulative impacts would occur. The FEIR concludes that the additional student population anticipated at buildout of the downtown would require the construction of at least one additional school. As indicated in the FEIR, the specific future location of a new school is unknown at present time. Pursuant to Section 15145 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), analysis of the physical changes in the Downtown Planning Area which may occur from future construction of schools would be speculative and no further analysis of their impacts is required.					X	X
(b) Substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new libraries? The proposed amendments do not include policies					X	X

Issues and Supporting Information	Significant And Not Mitigated (SNM)		Significant But Mitigated (SM)		Not Significant (NS)	
	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)
<p>or regulations that would alter the conclusions of the FEIR, nor include components that would generate additional demand necessitating the construction of new library facilities. The FEIR concludes that, cumulatively, development in the downtown would generate the need for a new Main Library and possibly several smaller libraries within the downtown. However, according to the analysis in the FEIR, the proposed project is considered to contribute to the cumulative need for new library facilities in the downtown identified in the FEIR. Nevertheless, the specific future location of these facilities (except the Main Library) is unknown at present time. Pursuant to Section 15145 of CEQA, analysis of the physical changes in the downtown planning area, which may occur from future construction of these public facilities, would be speculative and no further analysis of their impacts is required.</p>						
<p>(c) Substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new fire protection/emergency facilities? The proposed amendments do not include policies or regulations that would alter the conclusions of the FEIR, nor include components that would generate additional demand necessitating the construction of new fire protection/emergency facilities. The FEIR does not conclude that the cumulative development of the downtown area would generate additional demand necessitating the construction of new fire protection/emergency facilities. Therefore, no significant direct or cumulative impacts would occur</p>					X	X

Issues and Supporting Information	Significant And Not Mitigated (SNM)		Significant But Mitigated (SM)		Not Significant (NS)	
	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)
<p>Through the collective efforts of the City, the Redevelopment Agency, and CCDC, two sites for new fire stations have been secured in the downtown area. Potential impacts associated with one of the proposed sites, the Bayside Fire Station, have been evaluated in a Secondary Study prepared for the project. Upon approval of the contract for design services for the Bayside Fire Station, the proposed project would undergo further design review and entitlements process, along with subsequent environmental review. This subsequent environmental documentation prepared pursuant to CEQA would identify potentially significant impacts and appropriate mitigation measures. The other fire station site would also require the same procedures as the Bayside Fire Station site (i.e., preparation of a Secondary Study) and further environmental review and mitigation measures as appropriate.</p>						
<p>(d) Substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new law enforcement facilities? The proposed amendments do not include policies or regulations that would alter the conclusions of the FEIR, nor propose construction of any facilities or improvements that would generate substantial additional demand necessitating the construction of new law enforcement facilities in the Downtown Planning Area. The FEIR analyzes impacts to law enforcement service resulting from the cumulative development of the downtown and concludes that the construction of new law enforcement facilities would not be required.</p>					X	X

Issues and Supporting Information	Significant And Not Mitigated (SNM)		Significant But Mitigated (SM)		Not Significant (NS)	
	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)
However, the need for a new facility could be identified in the future. Pursuant to Section 15145 of CEQA, analysis of the physical changes in the downtown planning area, which may occur from future construction of law enforcement facilities, would be speculative and no further analysis of their impacts is required.						
(e) Substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new water transmission or treatment facilities? The proposed amendments do not include policies or regulations that would alter the conclusions of the FEIR, nor include components that would result in the construction of any facilities or improvements that would generate substantial additional demand necessitating the construction of new water transmission or treatment facilities in the Downtown Planning Area. The FEIR concludes that new water treatment facilities would not be required to address the cumulative development of the downtown. In addition, water pipe improvements that may be needed to serve the proposed project are categorically exempt from environmental review under CEQA as stated in the FEIR. Therefore, impacts associated with this issue would not be directly or cumulatively significant.					X	X
(f) Substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new storm water facilities? The proposed amendments do not include policies or regulations that would alter the conclusions of the FEIR, nor include components that would result in the construction of any facilities or improvements that would					X	X

Issues and Supporting Information	Significant And Not Mitigated (SNM)		Significant But Mitigated (SM)		Not Significant (NS)	
	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)
generate substantial additional demand necessitating the construction of new storm water facilities in the Downtown Planning Area. The FEIR concludes that the cumulative development of the downtown would not impact the existing downtown storm drain system. Therefore, no significant direct or cumulative impacts would occur.						
(g) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? The proposed amendments do not include policies or regulations that would alter the conclusions of the FEIR. The proposed amendments do not include components that would result in the construction of any facilities or improvements that would generate additional substantial demand for water necessitating the need for new or expanded entitlements. Direct and cumulative impacts associated with this issue are considered not significant.					X	X

Issues and Supporting Information	Significant And Not Mitigated (SNM)		Significant But Mitigated (SM)		Not Significant (NS)	
	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)
<p>(h) Substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new wastewater transmission or treatment facilities? The proposed amendments do not include policies or regulations that would alter the conclusions of the FEIR, nor include components that would result in the construction of any facilities or improvements that would generate additional substantial demand for wastewater transmission or treatment facilities. The FEIR concludes that new wastewater treatment facilities would not be required to address the cumulative development of the downtown. In addition, sewer improvements that may be needed to serve the proposed project are categorically exempt from environmental review under CEQA as stated in the FEIR. Therefore, direct or cumulative impacts associated with this issue would not be significant.</p>					X	X
<p>(i) Substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new landfill facilities? The proposed amendments do not include policies or regulations that would alter the conclusions of the FEIR, nor include components that would generate substantial additional demand for new landfill facilities. However, the FEIR concludes that cumulative development within the downtown would increase the amount of solid waste sent to the Miramar Landfill and contribute to the eventual need for an alternative landfill. The location and size of a new landfill is unknown at this time. Pursuant to Section 15145 of CEQA, analysis of the physical changes that may occur from future construction of</p>					X	X

Issues and Supporting Information	Significant And Not Mitigated (SNM)		Significant But Mitigated (SM)		Not Significant (NS)	
	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)
landfills would be speculative and no further analysis of their impacts is required Therefore, direct or cumulative impacts of the proposed project are not considered significant.						
2.14 PARKS & RECREATIONAL FACILITIES:						
(a) Substantial increase in 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? The proposed amendments do not include policies or regulations that would alter the conclusions of the FEIR. The FEIR discusses impacts to park and recreational facilities and the maintenance thereof and concludes that buildout of the Downtown Community Plan would not result in significant impacts associated with this issue. The proposed amendments would not allow for the construction of any housing units or improvements that would generate additional demand for parks and recreational facilities other than those assumed in the FEIR. Therefore, substantial deterioration of existing neighborhood or regional parks would not occur or be substantially accelerated as a result of the proposed project. No significant direct or cumulative impacts associated with this issue would occur.					X	X
2.15 TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC						
(a) Cause the level of service (LOS) on a roadway segment or intersection to drop below LOS E? The traffic impact analysis of the FEIR is a long-range, “macro-scale” study. That is, the study					X	X

Issues and Supporting Information	Significant And Not Mitigated (SNM)		Significant But Mitigated (SM)		Not Significant (NS)	
	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)
<p>considers forecast 2030 roadway systems and traffic volumes. Trip generation is based on the general land use designations of the Community Plan and does not assume any specific trip generation from any specific property due to the uncertainty associated with the ultimate type and intensity of use which may occur. In addition, the FEIR states that projects generating greater than 2,400 ADT would result in potentially significant impacts to the level of service (LOS) of a roadway segment or intersection, and requires implementation of mitigation measures at the project level to mitigate the impact. Any additional automobile trips generated by future development within the Downtown Planning Area would, in combination with the traffic generated by other downtown development, contribute to the significant cumulative traffic impacts projected in the FEIR to occur on a number of downtown roadway segments and intersections, and streets within neighborhoods surrounding the Plan area at buildout of the Community Plan. The FEIR includes mitigation measures to address these impacts, but they may or may not be able to fully mitigate these cumulative impacts.</p> <p>Given the nature of the majority of the proposed amendments, no substantial changes to the number of anticipated vehicle trips in the Downtown Planning Area are expected. The proposed amendments would have no impact on the transit, non-motorized circulation, or access, conclusions of the FEIR. Therefore, no direct or</p>						

Issues and Supporting Information	Significant And Not Mitigated (SNM)		Significant But Mitigated (SM)		Not Significant (NS)	
	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)
cumulative impacts associated with LOS of a roadway segment or intersection would occur as a result of the implementation of the proposed amendments.						
<p>(b) Cause the LOS on a freeway segment to drop below LOS E or cause a ramp delay in excess of 15 minutes? As described in section (a) above, the proposed amendments, would not contribute to traffic impacts greater than those analyzed in the FEIR and therefore the impact of the project on freeway segment LOS or ramp delays would be nearly identical to those identified in the FEIR.</p> <p>As summarized in the project description, the majority of the proposed amendments would clarify existing language and facilitate more efficient implementation of the policies set forth in the Downtown Community Plan, as well as create consistency among the related planning documents for downtown. In addition, the proposed amendments do not include modifications that would allow for greater intensity of development other than that which is assumed in the FEIR. Therefore, no significant direct or cumulative impacts associated with this issue area have been identified.</p>					X	X
<p>(c) Create an average demand for parking that would exceed the average available supply?</p> <p>The proposed amendments would revise the off-street parking requirements of the Marina PDO. This amendment would make the Marina PDO off-street parking requirements for office uses, commercial/retail uses, hotel rooms, and</p>					X	X

Issues and Supporting Information	Significant And Not Mitigated (SNM)		Significant But Mitigated (SM)		Not Significant (NS)	
	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)
<p>dwelling units identical to the Centre City PDO. Through compliance with the proposed parking requirements, future development within the Marina Planned District would provide a greater amount of parking than required under current regulations.</p> <p>However, even these increased parking requirements would not alter the FEIR's conclusions that the total parking demand generated by downtown development would exceed the amount of parking provided by such development in accordance with the Centre City PDO parking standards. Since the proposed amendments require the same amount of off-street parking spaces as the Centre City PDO, it is anticipated that the potential impacts would be reduced but not eliminated by the increased parking requirements. Implementation of FEIR Mitigation Measure TRFD. 1-1 would reduce, but not fully mitigate, the significant cumulative impact of excessive parking demand. This mitigation measure is an ongoing activity implemented by the City and CCDC that is not the direct responsibility of the proposed amendments. Furthermore, no feasible mitigation has been identified which could be implemented to mitigate this impact. Therefore, the proposed amendments would reduce but not eliminate the cumulatively significant and not mitigable shortfall in parking supply anticipated to occur throughout the downtown by the FEIR.</p>						
(d) Substantially discourage the use of alternative modes of transportation or cause transit					X	X

Issues and Supporting Information	Significant And Not Mitigated (SNM)		Significant But Mitigated (SM)		Not Significant (NS)	
	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)
<p>service capacity to be exceeded? The Downtown Planning area has an abundance of alternative transportation choices including the Coaster, Trolley, and bus lines. The proposed amendments do not include measures that would substantially discourage the use of alternative modes of transportation or cause transit service capacity to be exceeded. Additionally, SANDAG has indicated that transit facilities should be sufficient to serve the downtown population without exceeding capacity. Therefore, no impact will occur associated with transit or alternative modes of transportation.</p>						
2.16 MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE						
<p>(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? As indicated in the FEIR, due to the highly urbanized nature of the downtown area, no sensitive plant or animal species, habitats, or wildlife migration corridors are located in the Centre City area. Furthermore, the project does not have the potential to eliminate important examples of major periods of California history or prehistory at the project level. No other aspects of the project would substantially degrade the environment; therefore, no</p>					X	X

Issues and Supporting Information	Significant And Not Mitigated (SNM)		Significant But Mitigated (SM)		Not Significant (NS)	
	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)
significant direct or cumulative impact would occur. Cumulative impacts are described in subsection 16.b below.						
<p>(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)? As acknowledged in the FEIR, implementation of the Downtown Community Plan, PDO, and Redevelopment Plan would result in cumulative impacts associated with: aesthetics/visual quality, air quality, historical and archaeological resources, physical changes associated with transient activities, noise, parking, traffic, and water quality. As discussed in Section 15(c), the proposed amendments would contribute only to the cumulative impacts associated with parking. Implementation of the mitigation measures identified in the FEIR would help to reduce this impact; however, consistent with the conclusion in the FEIR, the proposed amendments would contribute cumulatively to the parking shortfall in the Downtown Planning Area. While this impact would remain significant and immitigable, they would not be greater than those identified in the FEIR.</p>						X
<p>(c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? Impacts associated with air quality, hazardous</p>					X	X

Issues and Supporting Information	Significant And Not Mitigated (SNM)		Significant But Mitigated (SM)		Not Significant (NS)	
	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)	Direct (D)	Cumulative (C)
materials, geology/soils, and noise have the potential to cause substantial adverse effects on human beings. As discussed throughout this study, the proposed project would not change the intensity of development established in the Downtown Community Plan and analyzed in the FEIR. As such, the proposed project would not result in significant and unmitigated impacts greater than those already assumed in the FEIR for these issue areas noted above. Therefore, the proposed project would not directly or indirectly result in substantial adverse effects on human beings.						

ATTACHMENT A
PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE 2006 FEIR MMRP

SIGNIFICANT IMPACT(S)	MITIGATION MEASURE(S)	IMPLEMENTATION TIME FRAME	IMPLEMENTATION RESPONSIBILITY	VERIFICATION RESPONSIBILITY
AIR QUALITY (AQ)				
No change in text.	No change in text.	No change in text.	No change in text.	No change in text.
HISTORICAL RESOURCES (HIST)				
<p>Impact HIST-A.1: Future development in downtown could impact significant architectural structures. (Direct and Cumulative)</p>	<p><i>Mitigation Measure HIST-A.1-1:</i> For historic <u>construction or development permits that may impact potentially historical</u> resources which are 45 years of age or older and which have not been evaluated for local, state and federal historic significance, CCDC shall consult with HRB to determine whether the resources is significant pursuant to CEQA, a site specific survey shall be required in accordance with the Historical Resources Regulations in the Land Development Code. Based on the survey and the best information available, City Staff to the Historical Resources Board (HRB) shall determine whether historical resources exist, whether potential historical resource(s) is/are eligible for designation as designated historical resource(s) by the HRB, and the precise location of the resource(s). The identified historical resource(s) may be nominated for HRB designation as a result of the survey pursuant to Chapter 12, Article 3, Division 2, Designation of Historical Resource procedures, of the Land Development Code.</p> <p>For resources that have been formally determined to be significant under federal, state or local criteria, the following actions shall be carried out under direction of CCDC in consultation with HRB, as appropriate. All applications for construction and development permits where historical resources are present on the site shall be evaluated by City Staff to the HRB pursuant to Chapter 14, Article 3, Division 2, Historical Resources Regulations of the Land Development Code.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> National Register-Listed/Eligible, California Register-Listed/Eligible Resources: Resources listed on <u>in</u> or formally determined eligible for the National Register or California Register and structures resources <u>structures</u> identified as contributing structures within a National or California Register District, shall be retained onsite and any improvements, renovation, rehabilitation and/or adaptive reuse of the property shall ensure its preservation according to and be consistent with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation, the Treatment of Historic Buildings and Properties (1995) and the associated Guidelines for Rehabilitation of Historic Buildings. 	<p>Prior to Development Permit (Design)</p> <p>Prior to Demolition, Grading, and/or Building Permit (Design)</p> <p>Prior to Certificate of Occupancy (Implementation)</p>	<p>Developer</p>	<p>CCDC/City</p>

SIGNIFICANT IMPACT(S)	MITIGATION MEASURE(S)	IMPLEMENTATION TIME FRAME	IMPLEMENTATION RESPONSIBILITY	VERIFICATION RESPONSIBILITY
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> San Diego Register-Listed Resources: Any development that proposes to remove or significantly alter one of these historical resources shall comply with <u>Resources listed in the San Diego Register of historical Resources, or determined to be a contributor to a San Diego Register District, shall, whenever possible, be retained on-site. Partial retention, relocation, or demolition of a resource shall only be permitted according to Chapter 14, Article 3, Division 2 of the San Diego Municipal Code which regulates</u> <u>2. Historical Resources Regulations of the Land Development Code.</u> 			
	<p>Mitigation Measure HIST-A.1-2: If the potential exists for direct and/or indirect impacts to retained or relocated designated <u>and/or potential historical resources (“historical resources”)</u>, the following measures shall be implemented <u>in coordination with a Development Services Department designee and/or City Staff to the Historic Resources Board (HRB) (“City Staff”) in accordance with Chapter 14, Article 3, Division 2, Historical Resources Regulations of the Land Development Code.</u></p> <p>I. Prior to Permit Issuance</p> <p>A Construction Plan Check</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Prior to Notice to Proceed (NTP) for any construction permits, including but not limited to, the first Grading Permit Building Permits, but prior to the first preconstruction meeting <u>Preconstruction (Precon) Meeting</u>, whichever is applicable, the Centre City Development Corporation (CCDC) Staff shall verify that the requirements for historical monitoring during demolition and/or stabilization have been noted on the appropriate construction documents. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Stabilization work can not begin until a Precon Meeting has been held at least one week prior to issuance of appropriate permits. Physical description, including the year and type of structure <u>historical resource</u>, and extent of stabilization shall be noted on the plans. <p>B. Submittal of Treatment Plan for Retained Historic <u>Historical</u> Resources</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Prior to Notice to Proceed (NTP) for any construction permits, 			

SIGNIFICANT IMPACT(S)	MITIGATION MEASURE(S)	IMPLEMENTATION TIME FRAME	IMPLEMENTATION RESPONSIBILITY	VERIFICATION RESPONSIBILITY
	<p>including but not limited to, the first Grading Permit and Building Permits, but prior to the first preconstruction meeting <u>Precon Meeting</u>, whichever is applicable, the Applicant shall submit a Treatment Plan to CCDC <u>City Staff</u> for review and approval that includes <u>in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (1995) and the associated Guidelines.</u> The Treatment Plan shall include <u>include</u> measures for protecting any historic buildings and/or building components <u>historical resources, as defined in the Land Development Code,</u> during construction related activities (e.g., removal of non-historic features, demolition of adjacent structures, subsurface structural support, etc.). The Treatment Plan shall be shown as notes on all construction documents (i.e., Grading and/or Building Plans).</p> <p>C. Letters of Qualification have been submitted to CCDC <u>City Staff</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The applicant shall submit a letter of verification to CCDC <u>City Staff</u> identifying the Principal Investigator (PI) for the project and the names of all persons involved in the historical monitoring program <u>this MMRP</u> (i.e., Architectural Historian, Historic Architect and/or Historian), as defined in the City of San Diego Historical Resources Guidelines (HRG). 2. CCDC <u>City Staff</u> will provide a letter to the applicant confirming that <u>the</u> qualifications of the PI and all persons involved in the historical monitoring of the project <u>meet the qualification standards established by the HRG.</u> 3. Prior to the start of work, the applicant must obtain approval from CCDC <u>City Staff</u> for any personnel changes associated with the monitoring program. <p>II. Prior to Start of Construction</p> <p>A. Documentation Program (DP)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prior to the first Precon Meeting and/or issuance of any construction permit, the DP shall be submitted to CCDC <u>City Staff</u> for review and approval and shall include the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Photo Documentation 			

SIGNIFICANT IMPACT(S)	MITIGATION MEASURE(S)	IMPLEMENTATION TIME FRAME	IMPLEMENTATION RESPONSIBILITY	VERIFICATION RESPONSIBILITY
	<p>(1) Documentation shall include professional quality photo documentation of the structure prior to demolition historical resource(s) prior to any construction that may cause direct and/or indirect impacts to the resource(s) with 35mm black and white photographs, 4x6 standard format, taken of all four elevations and close-ups of select architectural elements, such as, but not limited to, roof/wall junctions, window treatments, and decorative hardware. Photographs shall be of archival quality and easily reproducible.</p> <p>(2) Xerox copies or CD of the photographs shall be submitted for archival storage with the City of San Diego Historical Resources Board and the CCDC Project file. One set of original photographs and negatives shall be submitted for archival storage with the California Room of the City of San Diego Public Library, the San Diego Historical Society and/or other relative historical society or group(s).</p> <p>(b) Required drawings</p> <p>(1) Measured drawings of the building's exterior elevations depicting existing conditions or other relevant features shall be produced from recorded, accurate measurements. If portions of the building are not accessible for measurement, or cannot be reproduced from historic sources, they should not be drawn, but clearly labeled as not accessible. Drawings produced in ink on translucent material or archivally stable material (blue-line drawings) are acceptable. Standard drawing sizes are 19" x 24" or 24" x 36", standard scale is 1/4" = 1 foot.</p> <p>(2) One set of measured drawings shall be submitted for archival storage with the City of San Diego Historical Resources Board, the CCDC Project file, the South</p>			

SIGNIFICANT IMPACT(S)	MITIGATION MEASURE(S)	IMPLEMENTATION TIME FRAME	IMPLEMENTATION RESPONSIBILITY	VERIFICATION RESPONSIBILITY
	<p>Coastal Information Center, the California Room of the City of San Diego Public Library, the San Diego Historical Society and/or other historical society or group(s).</p> <p>2. Prior to the first Precon Meeting, CCDC<u>City Staff</u> shall verify that the DP has been approved.</p> <p>B. PI Shall Attend Precon Meetings</p> <p>1. Prior to beginning any work that requires monitoring<u>may impact any historical resource(s) which is/are subject to this MMRP</u>, the Applicant shall arrange a Precon Meeting that shall include the PI, Construction Manager (CM) and/or Grading Contractor, Resident Engineer (RE), <u>Historical Monitor(s)</u>, Building Inspector (BI), if appropriate, and CCDC<u>City Staff</u>. The qualified Historian and/or Architectural Historian shall attend any grading/excavation related Precon Meetings to make comments and/or suggestions concerning the Historical Monitoring program with the Construction Manager and/or Grading Contractor.</p> <p>(a) If the PI is unable to attend the Precon Meeting, the Applicant shall schedule a focused Precon Meeting with CCDC<u>City Staff</u>, the PI, RE, CM or BI, if appropriate, prior to the start of any work that requires monitoring.</p> <p>2. Historical Monitoring Plan (HMP)</p> <p>(a) Prior to the start of any work that requires monitoring<u>is subject to an HMP</u>, the PI shall submit a Historical Monitoring Plan<u>HMP</u> which describes how the monitoring would be accomplished for approval by CCDC<u>City Staff</u>. The HMP shall include an Historical Monitoring Exhibit (HME) based on the appropriate construction documents (reduced to 11x17) to CCDC<u>City Staff</u> identifying the areas to be monitored including the delineation of grading/excavation limits.</p> <p>(b) Prior to the start of any work, the PI shall also submit a construction schedule to CCDC<u>City Staff</u> through the RE indicating when and where monitoring will occur.</p>			

SIGNIFICANT IMPACT(S)	MITIGATION MEASURE(S)	IMPLEMENTATION TIME FRAME	IMPLEMENTATION RESPONSIBILITY	VERIFICATION RESPONSIBILITY
	<p>(c) The PI may submit a detailed letter to CCDC City Staff 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 underpinning, shoring and/or extensive excavation which could result in impacts to, and/or reduce impacts to the on-site or adjacent historic <u>historical</u> resource.</p> <p>C. Implementation of Approved Treatment Plan for Historic <u>Historical</u> Resources</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Implementation of the approved Treatment Plan for the protection of Historic Resources <u>historical resources</u> within the project site may not begin prior to the completion of the Documentation Program as defined above. 2. The Historian and/or Architectural Historian <u>qualified Historical Monitor(s)</u> shall attend weekly jobsite meetings and be on-site daily during the stabilization phase for any retained or adjacent historic <u>historical</u> resource to photo document the Treatment Plan process. 3. The Historian and/or Architectural Historian <u>qualified Historical Monitor(s)</u> shall document activity via the Consultant Site Visit Record (CSVR). The CSVR's shall be faxed by the CM to the RE the first day and last day (Notification of Monitoring Completion) of the Treatment Plan process and in the case of ANY unanticipated incidents. The RE shall forward copies to <u>CCDC City Staff</u>. 4. Prior to the start of any construction related activities, the applicant shall provide verification to CCDC City Staff that all historic <u>historical</u> resources on-site have been adequately stabilized in accordance with the approved Treatment Plan. This may include a site visit with <u>CCDC City Staff</u>, the CM, RE or BI, but may also be accomplished through submittal of the draft Treatment Plan photo documentation report. 5. <u>CCDC City Staff</u> will provide written verification to the RE or BI 			

SIGNIFICANT IMPACT(S)	MITIGATION MEASURE(S)	IMPLEMENTATION TIME FRAME	IMPLEMENTATION RESPONSIBILITY	VERIFICATION RESPONSIBILITY
	<p>after the site visit or upon approval of draft Treatment Plan report indicating that construction related activities can proceed.</p> <p>D. Verification of approval of a Historical Commemorative Program (HCP), if applicable</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The applicant shall submit documentation to CCDC for concurrent review and approval by HRB for a site specific HCP, if mitigation for impacts to a designated resource is based on association with an important person, event or community history and the building would not be retained on site. 2. CCDC shall provide a letter to the applicant approving or denying the proposal prior to the first preconstruction meeting and/or issuance of any construction permit. However, should CCDC grant conditional approval of the proposal, construction may be allowed to proceed, but the Certificate of Occupancy may not be issued until the historical commemorative program is approved. 3. Prior to the issuance of any Certificate of Occupancy, the applicant shall provide verification to CCDC that the HCP has been implemented in accordance with the approved program. This may include a site visit with CCDC, the CM, RE or BI, but may also be accomplished through submittal of photo documentation or appropriate reporting program. 4. CCDC will provide written verification to the RE or BI after the site visit indicating that the Certificate of Occupancy can issued. <p>III. During Construction</p> <p>A. <u>Qualified Historical Monitor(s)</u> Shall be Present During Grading/Excavation/Trenching</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The monitor<u>Qualified Historical Monitor(s)</u> shall be present full-time during grading/excavation/trenching activities which could result in impacts to historical resources as identified on the HME. The Construction Manager is responsible for notifying the RE, PI, and CCDC<u>City Staff</u> of changes to any construction activities. 2. The monitor<u>Qualified Historical Monitor(s)</u> shall document field activity via the Consultant Site Visit Record (CSV). The 			

SIGNIFICANT IMPACT(S)	MITIGATION MEASURE(S)	IMPLEMENTATION TIME FRAME	IMPLEMENTATION RESPONSIBILITY	VERIFICATION RESPONSIBILITY
	<p>CSVSR's shall be faxed 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 incidents involving the historical resource. The RE shall forward copies to <u>CCDCCity Staff</u>.</p> <p>3. The PI may submit a detailed letter to <u>CCDCCity Staff</u> during construction requesting a modification to the monitoring program when a field condition arises which could effect the historical resource being retained on-site or adjacent to the construction site.</p> <p>B. Notification Process</p> <p>1. In the event of damage to a historical resource retained on-site or adjacent to the project site, the <u>Qualified Historical Monitor(s)</u> shall direct the contractor to temporarily divert construction activities in the area of historical resource and immediately notify the RE or BI, as appropriate, and the PI (unless Monitor is the PI).</p> <p>2. The PI shall immediately notify <u>CCDCCity Staff</u> by phone of the incident, and shall also submit written documentation to <u>CCDCCity Staff</u> within 24 hours by fax or email with photos of the resource in context, if possible.</p> <p>C. Determination/Evaluation of Impacts to a Historical Resource</p> <p>1. The PI shall evaluate the incident relative to the historical resource.</p> <p>(a) The PI shall immediately notify <u>CCDCCity Staff</u> by phone to discuss the incident and shall also submit a letter to <u>CCDCCity Staff</u> indicating whether additional mitigation is required.</p> <p>(b) If impacts to the historical resource are significant, the PI shall submit a proposal for <u>mitigationCity Staff review</u> and obtain written approval from CCDC<u>written approval in accordance with Chapter 14, Article 3, Division 2, Historical Resources Regulations of the Land Development Code and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of</u></p>			

SIGNIFICANT IMPACT(S)	MITIGATION MEASURE(S)	IMPLEMENTATION TIME FRAME	IMPLEMENTATION RESPONSIBILITY	VERIFICATION RESPONSIBILITY
	<p><u>Historic Properties (1995) and the associated Guidelines.</u> Direct and/or indirect impacts to historical resources from construction activities must be mitigated before work will be allowed to resume.</p> <p>(c) If impacts to the historical resource are not considered significant, the PI shall submit a letter to CCDC <u>City Staff</u> indicating that the incident will be documented in the Final Monitoring Report. The letter shall also indicate that that no further work is required.</p> <p>IV. Night Work</p> <p>A. If night <u>and/or weekend</u> work is included in the contract</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. When night <u>and/or weekend</u> work is included in the contract package, the extent and timing shall be presented and discussed at the precon meeting <u>Precon Meeting</u>. 2. The following procedures shall be followed. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (a) No Impacts/Incidents In the event that no historical resources were impacted during night <u>and/or weekend</u> work, the PI shall record the information on the CSVR and submit to CCDC <u>City Staff</u> via fax by 9 am the following morning, if possible <u>8 am of the next business day</u>. (b) Potentially Significant Impacts If the PI determines that a potentially significant impact has occurred to a historical resource, the procedures detailed under Section III - During Construction shall be followed. (c) The PI shall immediately contact CCDC <u>City Staff</u>, or by 8 am the following morning of the next business day to report and discuss the findings as indicated in Section III-B, unless other specific arrangements have been made. <p>B. If night <u>and/or weekend</u> work becomes necessary during the course of construction:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 CCDC <u>City Staff</u> immediately. 			

SIGNIFICANT IMPACT(S)	MITIGATION MEASURE(S)	IMPLEMENTATION TIME FRAME	IMPLEMENTATION RESPONSIBILITY	VERIFICATION RESPONSIBILITY
	<p>C. All other procedures described above shall apply, as appropriate.</p> <p>V. Post Construction</p> <p>A. Submittal of Draft Monitoring Report</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The PI shall submit two copies of the Draft Monitoring Report (even if negative), <u>prepared in accordance with the Historical Resources Guidelines and Appendices</u> which describes the results, analysis, and conclusions of all phases of the Historical Monitoring Program (with appropriate graphics) to CCDC <u>City Staff</u> for review and approval within 90 days following the completion of monitoring. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (a) The preconstruction Treatment Plan and Documentation Plan (photos and measured drawings) and Historical Commemorative Program, if applicable, shall be included and/or incorporated into the Draft Monitoring Report. (b) The PI shall be responsible for updating (on the appropriate State of California Department of Park and Recreation forms-DPR 523 A/B) any existing site forms to document the partial and/or complete demolition of the resource. Updated forms shall be submitted to the South Coastal Information Center with the Final Monitoring Report. 2. CCDC <u>City Staff</u> 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 CCDC <u>City Staff</u> for approval. 4. CCDC <u>City Staff</u> shall provide written verification to the PI of the approved report. 5. CCDC <u>City Staff</u> shall notify the RE or BI, as appropriate, of receipt of all Draft Monitoring Report submittals and approvals. <p>B. Final Monitoring Report(s)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The PI shall submit one copy of the approved Final Monitoring Report to the RE or BI as appropriate, and one copy to CCDC <u>City Staff</u> (even if negative), within 90 days after notification from CCDC <u>City Staff</u> that the draft report has been approved. 			

SIGNIFICANT IMPACT(S)	MITIGATION MEASURE(S)	IMPLEMENTATION TIME FRAME	IMPLEMENTATION RESPONSIBILITY	VERIFICATION RESPONSIBILITY
	<p>2. The RE shall, in no case, issue the Notice of Completion until receiving a copy of the approved Final Monitoring Report from <u>CCDC</u> <u>City Staff</u>.</p>			
	<p>Mitigation Measure HIST-A.1-3: If a Designated Local Register designated or potential historical resource (“historical resource”) as defined in the Land Development Code would be demolished, the following measure shall be implemented in accordance with Chapter 14, Article 3, Division 2, Historical Resources Regulations of the Land Development Code.</p> <p>I. Prior to Issuance of a Demolition Permit</p> <p>A. A Documentation Program (DP) shall be submitted to <u>CCDC</u> <u>City Staff</u> <u>to the Historic Resources Board (HRB) (“City Staff”)</u> for review and approval and shall include the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Photo Documentation <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Documentation shall include professional quality photo documentation of the structure prior to demolition with 35mm black and white photographs, 4x6 standard format, taken of all four elevations and close-ups of select architectural elements, such as, but not limited to, roof/wall junctions, window treatments, decorative hardware. Photographs shall be of archival quality and easily reproducible. (b) Xerox copies or CD of the photographs shall be submitted for archival storage with the City of San Diego Historical Resources Board and the CCDC Project file. One set of original photographs and negatives shall be submitted for archival storage with the California Room of the City of San Diego Public Library, the San Diego Historical Society and/or other relative historical society or group(s). 2. Required drawings <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Measured drawings of the building’s exterior elevations depicting existing conditions or other relevant features shall be produced from recorded, accurate measurements. If portions of the building are not accessible for measurement, or cannot be reproduced from historic sources, they should not be drawn, but clearly labeled as not accessible. Drawings produced in ink on translucent 			

SIGNIFICANT IMPACT(S)	MITIGATION MEASURE(S)	IMPLEMENTATION TIME FRAME	IMPLEMENTATION RESPONSIBILITY	VERIFICATION RESPONSIBILITY
	<p>material or archivally stable material (blueline drawings are acceptable). Standard drawing sizes are 19" x 24" or 24" x 36", standard scale is 1/4" = 1 foot.</p> <p>(b) One set of measured drawings shall be submitted for archival storage with the City of San Diego Historical Resources Board, the CCDC Project file, the South Coastal Information Center, the California Room of the City of San Diego Public Library, the San Diego Historical Society and/or other historical society or group(s).</p> <p>B. Prior to the first Precon Meeting <u>City Staff</u> shall verify that the DP has been approved.</p> <p><i>Mitigation Measure HIST-A.1-3:</i> If a Designated Local Register <u>designated or potential</u> historical resource ("historical resource") as defined in the <u>Land Development Code</u> would be demolished, the following measure shall be implemented in accordance with <u>Chapter 14, Article 3, Division 2, Historical Resources Regulations of the Land Development Code.</u></p> <p>I. Prior to Issuance of a Demolition Permit</p> <p>A. A Documentation Program (DP) shall be submitted to CCDC <u>City Staff to the Historic Resources Board (HRB)</u> ("City Staff") for review and approval and shall include the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Photo Documentation <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Documentation shall include professional quality photo documentation of the structure prior to demolition with 35mm black and white photographs, 4x6 standard format, taken of all four elevations and close-ups of select architectural elements, such as, but not limited to, roof/wall junctions, window treatments, decorative hardware. Photographs shall be of archival quality and easily reproducible. (b) Xerox copies or CD of the photographs shall be submitted for archival storage with the City of San Diego Historical Resources Board and the CCDC Project file. One set of original photographs and negatives shall be submitted for archival storage with the California Room of the City of 			

SIGNIFICANT IMPACT(S)	MITIGATION MEASURE(S)	IMPLEMENTATION TIME FRAME	IMPLEMENTATION RESPONSIBILITY	VERIFICATION RESPONSIBILITY
	<p>San Diego Public Library, the San Diego Historical Society and/or other relative historical society or group(s).</p> <p>2. Required drawings</p> <p>(a) Measured drawings of the building’s exterior elevations depicting existing conditions or other relevant features shall be produced from recorded, accurate measurements. If portions of the building are not accessible for measurement, or cannot be reproduced from historic sources, they should not be drawn, but clearly labeled as not accessible. Drawings produced in ink on translucent material or archivally stable material (blue-line drawings are acceptable). Standard drawing sizes are 19" x 24" or 24" x 36", standard scale is 1/4" = 1 foot.</p> <p>(b) One set of measured drawings shall be submitted for archival storage with the City of San Diego Historical Resources Board, the CCDC Project file, the South Coastal Information Center, the California Room of the City of San Diego Public Library, the San Diego Historical Society and/or other historical society or group(s).</p>			
	<p>B. Prior to the first Precon Meeting, CCDC <u>City Staff</u> shall verify that the DP has been approved.</p> <p>C. In addition to the Documentation Program, the Applicant shall comply with any other conditions contained in the Site Development Permit, as approved through the City’s Historic Regulations contained in pursuant to Chapter 14, Article 3, Division 2, which shall include but not be limited to one or more actions prepared and adopted by the HRB for demolition of the Local Register Resource <u>Historical Resources Regulations of the Land Development Code.</u></p>			
<p>Impact HIST-B.1: Development in downtown could impact significant buried archaeological resources. (Direct and Cumulative)</p>	<p><u>Mitigation Measure HIST-B.1-1:</u> If the potential exists for <u>direct and/or indirect impacts to significant buried</u> archaeological resources, the following measures shall be implemented: <u>in coordination with a Development Services Department designee and/or City Staff to the Historic Resources Board (HRB) (“City Staff”) in accordance with Chapter 14, Article 3, Division 2, Historical Resources Regulations of the Land Development Code. Prior to issuance of any permit that could directly affect an archaeological resource, City Staff shall assure that all elements of the MMRP are performed in accordance with all applicable City regulations and guidelines by an Archaeologist meeting the</u></p>	<p>Prior to Demolition or Grading Permit (Design)</p> <p>Prior to Certificate of Occupancy (Implementation)</p>	<p>Developer</p>	<p>CCDC <u>City Staff</u></p>

SIGNIFICANT IMPACT(S)	MITIGATION MEASURE(S)	IMPLEMENTATION TIME FRAME	IMPLEMENTATION RESPONSIBILITY	VERIFICATION RESPONSIBILITY
	<p><u>qualifications specified in Appendix B of the San Diego Land Development Code, Historical Resources Guidelines. City Staff shall also require that the following steps be taken to determine: (1) the presence of archaeological resources and (2) the appropriate mitigation for any significant resources which may be impacted by a development activity. Sites may include residential and commercial properties, privies, trash pits, building foundations, and industrial features representing the contributions of people from diverse socio-economic and ethnic backgrounds. Sites may also include resources associated with pre-historic Native American activities. Archeological resources which also meet the definition of historical resources or unique archaeological resources under CEQA or the SDMC shall be treated in accordance with the following evaluation procedures and applicable mitigation program:</u></p> <p><u>Step 1-Initial Evaluation</u></p> <p><u>An initial evaluation for the potential of significant subsurface archaeological resources shall be prepared to the satisfaction of City Staff as part of an Environmental Secondary Study for any activity which involves excavation or building demolition. The initial evaluation shall be guided by an appropriate level research design in accordance with the City’s Land Development Code, Historical Resources Guidelines. The person completing the initial review shall meet the qualification requirements as set forth in the Historical Resources Guidelines and shall be approved by City Staff. The initial evaluation shall consist, at a minimum, of a review of the following historical sources: The 1876 Bird’s Eye View of San Diego, all Sanborn Fire Insurance Company maps, appropriate City directories and maps that identify historical properties or archaeological sites, and a records search at the South Coastal Information Center for archaeological resources located within the property boundaries. Historical and existing land uses shall also be reviewed to assess the potential presence of significant prehistoric and historic archaeological resources. The person completing the initial review shall also consult with and consider input from local individuals and groups with expertise in the historical resources of the San Diego area. These experts may include the University of California, San Diego State University, San Diego Museum of Man, Save Our Heritage Organization (SOHO), local historical and archaeological groups, the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), designated community planning groups, and other individuals or groups that may have specific knowledge of the area. Consultation with these or other individuals and groups shall occur as early as possible in the evaluation process.</u></p>			

SIGNIFICANT IMPACT(S)	MITIGATION MEASURE(S)	IMPLEMENTATION TIME FRAME	IMPLEMENTATION RESPONSIBILITY	VERIFICATION RESPONSIBILITY
	<p><u>When the initial evaluation indicates that important archaeological sites may be present on a project site but their presence cannot be confirmed prior to construction or demolition due to obstructions or spatially limited testing and data recovery, the applicant shall prepare and implement an archaeological monitoring program as a condition of development approval to the satisfaction of City Staff. If the NAHC Sacred Lands File search is positive for Native American resources within the project site, then additional evaluation must include participation of a local Native American consultant in accordance with CEQA Sections 15064.5(d), 15126.4(b)(3) and Public Resources Code Section 21083.2.</u></p> <p><u>No further action is required if the initial evaluation demonstrates there is no potential for subsurface resources. The results of this research shall be summarized in the Secondary Study.</u></p> <p><u>Step 2-Testing</u></p> <p><u>A testing program is required if the initial evaluation demonstrates that there is a potential for subsurface resources. The testing program shall be conducted during the hazardous materials remediation or following the removal of any structure or surface covering which may be underlain by potential resources. The removal of these structures shall be conducted in a manner which minimizes disturbance of underlying soil. This shall entail a separate phase of investigations from any mitigation monitoring during construction.</u></p> <p><u>The testing program shall be performed by a qualified Historical Archaeologist meeting the qualifications specified in Appendix B of the San Diego Land Development Code, Historical Resources Guidelines. The Historical Archaeologist must be approved by City Staff prior to commencement. Before commencing the testing, a treatment plan shall be submitted for City Staff approval that reviews the initial evaluation results and includes a research design. The research design shall be prepared in accordance with the City's Historical Resources Guidelines and include a discussion of field methods, research questions against which discoveries shall be evaluated for significance, collection strategy, laboratory and analytical approaches, and curation arrangements. All tasks shall be in conformity with best practices in the field of historic urban archaeology. A recommended approach for historic urban sites is at a minimum fills and debris along interior lot lines or other areas indicated on Sanborn maps.</u></p>			

SIGNIFICANT IMPACT(S)	MITIGATION MEASURE(S)	IMPLEMENTATION TIME FRAME	IMPLEMENTATION RESPONSIBILITY	VERIFICATION RESPONSIBILITY
	<p><u>Security measures such as a locked fence or surveillance shall be taken to prevent looting or vandalism of archaeological resources as soon as demolition is complete or paved surfaces are removed. These measures shall be maintained during archaeological field investigations. It is recommended that exposed features be covered with steel plates or fill dirt when not being investigated.</u></p> <p><u>The results of the testing phase shall be submitted in writing to City Staff and shall include the research design, testing results, significance evaluation, and recommendations for further treatment. Final determination of significance shall be made in consultation with City Staff, and with the Native American community, if the finds are prehistoric. If no significant resources are found and site conditions are such that there is no potential for further discoveries, then no further action is required. If no significant resources are found but results of the initial evaluation and testing phase indicates there is still a potential for resources to be present in portions of the property that could not be tested, then mitigation monitoring is required and shall be conducted in accordance with the provisions set forth in Step 4 - Monitoring. If significant resources are discovered during the testing program, then data recovery in accordance with Step 3 shall be undertaken prior to construction. If the existence or probable likelihood of Native American human remains or associated grave goods area discovered through the testing program, the Qualified Archaeologist shall stop work in the area, notify the City Building Inspector, City staff, and immediately implement the procedures set forth in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 and the California Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 5097.98 for discovery of human remains. This procedure is further detailed in the Mitigation, Monitoring and Reporting Program (Step 4). City Staff must concur with evaluation results before the next steps can proceed.</u></p> <p><u>Step 3-Data Recovery</u></p> <p><u>For any site determined to be significant, a Research Design and Data Recovery Program (RDDR) shall be prepared in accordance with the City's Historical Resources Guidelines, approved by City Staff, and carried out to mitigate impacts before any activity is conducted which could potentially disturb significant resources. The archaeologist shall notify City Staff of the date upon which data recovery will commence ten (10) working days in advance.</u></p> <p><u>All cultural materials collected shall be cleaned, catalogued and permanently curated with an appropriate institution. Native American burial resources shall be treated in the manner agreed to by the Native American representative or be</u></p>			

SIGNIFICANT IMPACT(S)	MITIGATION MEASURE(S)	IMPLEMENTATION TIME FRAME	IMPLEMENTATION RESPONSIBILITY	VERIFICATION RESPONSIBILITY
	<p><u>reentered on the site in an area not subject to further disturbance in accordance with CEQA section 15164.5 and the Public Resources Code section 5097.98. All artifacts shall be analyzed to identify function and chronology as they relate to the history of the area. Faunal material shall be identified as to species and specialty studies shall be completed, as appropriate. All newly discovered archaeological sites shall be recorded with the South Coastal Information Center at San Diego State University. Any human bones and associated grave goods of Native American origin encountered during Step 2-Testing, shall, upon consultation, be turned over to the appropriate Native American representative(s) for treatment in accordance with state regulations as further outlined under Step 4-Monitoring (Section IV. Discovery of Human Remains).</u></p> <p><u>A draft Data Recovery Report shall be submitted to City Staff within twelve months of the commencement of the data recovery. Data Recovery Reports shall describe the research design or questions, historic context of the finds, field results, analysis of artifacts, and conclusions. Appropriate figures, maps and tables shall accompany the text. The report shall also include a catalogue of all finds and a description of curation arrangements at an approved facility, and a general statement indicating the disposition of any human remains encountered during the data recovery effort (please note that the location of reinternment and/or repatriation is confidential and not subject to public disclosure in accordance with state law). Finalization of draft reports shall be subject to City Staff review.</u></p> <p><u>Step 4 – Monitoring</u></p> <p><u>If no significant resources are encountered, but results of the initial evaluation and testing phase indicates there is still a potential for resources to be present in portions of the property that could not be tested, then mitigation monitoring is required and shall be conducted in accordance with the following provisions and components:</u></p> <p>I. Prior to Permit Issuance</p> <p>A. Construction Plan Check</p> <p>1. Prior to Notice to Proceed (NTP) for any construction permits, including but not limited to, the first Grading Permit, Demolition Permits and Building Permits, but prior to the first preconstruction meeting <u>Precon Meeting</u>, whichever is applicable, the Centre City Development Corporation (CCDC) Staff shall verify that the requirements for</p>			

SIGNIFICANT IMPACT(S)	MITIGATION MEASURE(S)	IMPLEMENTATION TIME FRAME	IMPLEMENTATION RESPONSIBILITY	VERIFICATION RESPONSIBILITY
	<p>Archaeological Monitoring and Native American monitoring, if applicable where the project may impact Native American resources, have been noted on the appropriate construction documents.</p> <p>B. Letters of Qualification have been submitted to CCDCCity Staff</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The applicant shall submit a letter of verification to CCDCCity Staff 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. CCDCCity Staff will provide a letter to the applicant confirming that the qualifications of the PI and all persons involved in the archaeological monitoring of the project <u>meet the qualifications established in the HRG</u>. 3. Prior to the start of work, the applicant must obtain <u>written approval from CCDCCity Staff</u> for any personnel changes associated with the monitoring program. <p>II. Prior to Start of Construction</p> <p>A. Verification of Records Search</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The PI shall provide verification to CCDCCity Staff 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 CoastCoastal 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 CCDCCity Staff requesting a reduction to the 1/4 mile radius. <p>B. PI Shall Attend Precon Meetings</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prior to beginning any work that requires monitoring, the Applicant shall arrange a Precon Meeting that shall include the PI, <u>Native American consultant/monitor (where Native American resources may be impacted)</u>, Construction Manager (CM) and/or Grading Contractor, Resident Engineer (RE), <u>the Native</u> 			

SIGNIFICANT IMPACT(S)	MITIGATION MEASURE(S)	IMPLEMENTATION TIME FRAME	IMPLEMENTATION RESPONSIBILITY	VERIFICATION RESPONSIBILITY
	<p><u>American representative(s) (where Native American resources may be impacted), Building Inspector (BI), if appropriate, and CCDCCity Staff. The qualified Archaeologist and the Native American consultant/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.</u></p> <p>(a) If the PI is unable to attend the Precon Meeting, the Applicant shall schedule a focused Precon Meeting with <u>CCDCCity Staff</u>, the PI, RE, CM or BI, if appropriate, prior to the start of any work that requires monitoring.</p> <p>2. Archaeological Monitoring Plan (AMP)</p> <p>(a) Prior to the start of any work that requires monitoring, the PI shall submit an Archaeological Monitoring Plan <u>(with verification that the AMP has been reviewed and approved by the Native American consultant/monitor when NA resources may be impacted)</u> which describes how the monitoring would be accomplished for approval by <u>CCDCCity Staff and the Native American monitor</u>. The AMP shall include an Archaeological Monitoring Exhibit (AME) based on the appropriate construction documents (reduced to 11x17) to <u>CCDCCity Staff</u> identifying the areas to be monitored including the delineation of grading/excavation limits.</p> <p>(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).</p> <p>(c) Prior to the start of any work, the PI shall also submit a construction schedule to <u>CCDCCity Staff</u> through the RE indicating when and where monitoring will occur.</p> <p>(d) The PI may submit a detailed letter to <u>CCDCCity Staff</u> 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.</p> <p>III. During Construction</p>			

SIGNIFICANT IMPACT(S)	MITIGATION MEASURE(S)	IMPLEMENTATION TIME FRAME	IMPLEMENTATION RESPONSIBILITY	VERIFICATION RESPONSIBILITY
	<p>A. Monitor(s) Shall be Present During Grading/Excavation/Trenching</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The <u>Archaeological</u> monitor shall be present full-time during <u>all soil remediation/disturbing and grading/excavation /trenching activities</u> which could result in impacts to archaeological resources as identified on the AME. The Construction Manager is responsible for notifying the RE, PI, and <u>CCDC/City Staff</u> of changes to any construction activities. 2. The <u>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 City Staff. If prehistoric resources are encountered during the Native American consultant/monitor's absence, work shall stop and the Discovery Notification Processes detailed in Sections III.B-C, and IVA-D, shall commence.</u> 3. <u>The archeological and Native American consultant/monitor shall document field activity via the Consultant Site Visit Record (CSVR). The CSVR's shall be faxed 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 CCDC/City Staff.</u> 3.4. The PI may submit a detailed letter to <u>CCDC/City Staff</u> 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 <u>that</u> may reduce or increase the potential for resources to be present. <p>B. Discovery Notification Process</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In the event of a discovery, the Archaeological Monitor shall direct the contractor to temporarily divert trenching <u>all soil disturbing activities, including but not limited to, digging, trenching, excavating, or grading</u> activities in the area of <u>discovery and in the area reasonably suspected to overlay adjacent resources</u> 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. 			

SIGNIFICANT IMPACT(S)	MITIGATION MEASURE(S)	IMPLEMENTATION TIME FRAME	IMPLEMENTATION RESPONSIBILITY	VERIFICATION RESPONSIBILITY
	<p>3. The PI shall immediately notify <u>CCDEC City Staff</u> by phone of the discovery, and shall also submit written documentation to <u>CCDEC City Staff</u> within 24 hours by fax or email with photos of the resource in context, if possible.</p> <p>4. <u>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.</u></p> <p>C. Determination of Significance</p> <p>1. The PI and Native American representative, if applicable <u>consultant/monitor, where Native American resources are discovered</u>, shall evaluate the significance of the resource. If Human Remains are involved, follow protocol in Section IV below.</p> <p>(a) The PI shall immediately notify <u>CCDEC City Staff</u> by phone to discuss significance determination and shall also submit a letter to <u>CCDEC City Staff</u> indicating whether additional mitigation is required.</p> <p>(b) If the resource is significant, the PI shall submit an Archaeological Data Recovery Program (ADRP) <u>which has been reviewed by the Native American consultant/monitor when applicable,</u> and obtain written approval from <u>CCDEC City Staff and the Native American representative(s), if applicable.</u> Impacts to significant resources must be mitigated before ground disturbing activities in the area of discovery will be allowed to resume.</p> <p>(c) If <u>the</u> resource is not significant, the PI shall submit a letter to <u>CCDEC City Staff</u> 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.</p> <p>IV. Discovery of Human Remains</p> <p>If human remains are discovered, work shall halt in that area and <u>no soil shall be exported off-site until a determination can be made regarding the provenance of the human remains; and the following procedures 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:</u></p> <p>A. Notification</p>			

SIGNIFICANT IMPACT(S)	MITIGATION MEASURE(S)	IMPLEMENTATION TIME FRAME	IMPLEMENTATION RESPONSIBILITY	VERIFICATION RESPONSIBILITY
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Archaeological Monitor shall notify the RE or BI as appropriate, CCDC <u>City Staff</u>, and the PI, if the Monitor is not qualified as a PI. <u>City Staff will notify the appropriate Senior Planner in the Environmental Analysis Section (EAS) of the Development Services Department to assist with the discovery process.</u> 2. The PI shall notify the Medical Examiner after consultation with the RE, either in person or via telephone. <p>B. Isolate discovery site</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 provenience <u>provenience</u> of the remains. 2. The Medical Examiner, in consultation with the PI, shall <u>will</u> determine the need for a field examination to determine the provenience <u>provenience</u>. 3. If a field examination is not warranted, the Medical Examiner shall <u>will</u> determine with input from the PI, if the remains are or are most likely to be of Native American origin. <p>C. If Human Remains are determined to be Native American</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Medical Examiner shall <u>will</u> notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) <u>within 24 hours</u>. By law, only ONLY the Medical Examiner can make this call. 2. The NAHC shall contact the PI within 24 hours or sooner, after Medical Examiner has completed coordination. 3. NAHC shall <u>NAHC will immediately</u> identify the person or persons determined to be the Most Likely Descendent (MLD) and provide contact information. 4. The PI shall coordinate with the MLD for additional consultation. 3. <u>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 Section 15064.5(e) and the California Public Resources and Health & Safety Codes.</u> 4. <u>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.</u> 5. Disposition of Native American Human Remains shall <u>will</u> be 			

SIGNIFICANT IMPACT(S)	MITIGATION MEASURE(S)	IMPLEMENTATION TIME FRAME	IMPLEMENTATION RESPONSIBILITY	VERIFICATION RESPONSIBILITY
	<p>determined between the MLD and the PI, <u>and if:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) The NAHC is unable to identify the MLD, OR the MLD failed to make a recommendation within <u>2448</u> hours after being notified by the Commission; 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, <u>THEN,</u> (c) <u>In order to protect these sites, the Landowner shall do one or more of the following:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>(1) Record the site with the NAHC;</u> <u>(2) Record an open space or conservation easement on the site;</u> <u>(3) Record a document with the County.</u> <p>6. <u>Upon the discovery of multiple Native American human remains during a ground disturbing land development activity, the landowner may agree that additional conferral with descendants is necessary to consider culturally appropriate treatment of multiple Native American human remains. Culturally appropriate treatment of such a discovery may be ascertained from review of the site utilizing cultural and archaeological standards. Where the parties are unable to agree on the appropriate treatment measures the human remains and buried with Native American human remains shall be reinterred with appropriate dignity, pursuant to Section 5.c., above.</u></p> <p>D. If Human Remains are not Native American</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The PI shall contact the Medical Examiner and notify them of the historic era context of the burial. 2. The Medical Examiner will determine the appropriate course of action with the PI and City staff (PRC 5097.98). 3. If the remains are of historic origin, they shall be appropriately removed and conveyed to the <u>San Diego</u> Museum of Man for analysis. The decision for internment of the human remains shall be made in consultation with <u>CCDCity Staff,</u> the applicant/landowner and the <u>San Diego</u> Museum of Man. <p>V. <u>Night and/or Weekend Work</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. If night <u>and/or</u> work is included in the contract <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. When night <u>and/or weekend</u> work is included in the contract package, the extent and timing shall be presented and discussed 			

SIGNIFICANT IMPACT(S)	MITIGATION MEASURE(S)	IMPLEMENTATION TIME FRAME	IMPLEMENTATION RESPONSIBILITY	VERIFICATION RESPONSIBILITY
	<p>at the precon meeting <u>Precon Meeting</u>.</p> <p>2. The following procedures shall be followed.</p> <p>(a) No Discoveries In the event that no discoveries were encountered during night <u>and/or weekend</u> work, the PI shall record the information on the CSVR and submit to CCDC City Staff via fax by 9am the following morning, if possible <u>8 am of the next business day</u>.</p> <p>(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, <u>Discovery of human remains shall always be treated as a significant discovery</u>.</p> <p>(c) Potentially Significant Discoveries If the PI determines that a potentially significant discovery has been made, the procedures detailed under Section III - During Construction <u>and IV-Discovery of Human Remains</u> shall be followed.</p> <p><u>(d)</u> The PI shall immediately contact CCDC <u>City Staff</u>, or by 8AM am of the following morning <u>next business day</u> to report and discuss the findings as indicated in Section III-B, unless other specific arrangements have been made.</p> <p>B. If night <u>and/or weekend</u> work becomes necessary during the course of construction</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 CCDC <u>City Staff</u> immediately. <p>C. All other procedures described above shall apply, as appropriate.</p> <p>VI. Post Construction</p> <p>A. Submittal of Draft Monitoring Report</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The PI shall submit two copies of the Draft Monitoring Report (even if negative) <u>prepared in accordance with the Historical Resources Guidelines and Appendices</u> which describes the results, analysis, and conclusions of all phases of the Archaeological Monitoring Program (with appropriate graphics) to CCDC <u>City Staff</u>, for review and approval within 90 days following the completion of monitoring, 			

SIGNIFICANT IMPACT(S)	MITIGATION MEASURE(S)	IMPLEMENTATION TIME FRAME	IMPLEMENTATION RESPONSIBILITY	VERIFICATION RESPONSIBILITY
	<p>(a) For significant archaeological resources encountered during monitoring, the Archaeological Data Recovery Program shall be included in the Draft Monitoring Report.</p> <p>(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.</p> <p>2. <u>CCDCCity Staff</u> shall return the Draft Monitoring Report to the PI for revision or, for preparation of the Final Report.</p> <p>3. The PI shall submit revised Draft Monitoring Report to <u>CCDCCity Staff</u> for approval.</p> <p>4. <u>CCDCCity Staff</u> shall provide written verification to the PI of the approved report.</p> <p>5. <u>CCDCCity Staff</u> shall notify the RE or BI, as appropriate, of receipt of all Draft Monitoring Report submittals and approvals.</p> <p>B. Handling of Artifacts and Submittal of Collections Management Plan, if applicable</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 PI shall submit a Collections Management Plan to <u>CCDCCity Staff</u> for review and approval for any project which results in a substantial collection of historical artifacts. <p>C. Curation of artifacts: Accession Agreement and Acceptance Verification</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 <u>CCDCCity Staff</u> and the Native American representative, as applicable. 			

SIGNIFICANT IMPACT(S)	MITIGATION MEASURE(S)	IMPLEMENTATION TIME FRAME	IMPLEMENTATION RESPONSIBILITY	VERIFICATION RESPONSIBILITY
	<p>2. The PI shall include the Acceptance Verification from the curation institution in the Final Monitoring Report submitted to the RE or BI and <u>CCDC City Staff</u>.</p> <p>3. <u>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 in accordance with section IV – Discovery of Human Remains, subsection 5.(d).</u></p> <p>D. Final Monitoring Report(s)</p> <p>1. The PI shall submit one copy of the approved Final Monitoring Report to the RE or BI as appropriate, and one copy to <u>CCDC City Staff</u> (even if negative), within 90 days after notification from <u>CCDC City Staff</u> that the draft report has been approved.</p> <p>2. The RE shall, in no case, issue the Notice of Completion until receiving a copy of the approved Final Monitoring Report from <u>CCDC City Staff</u> which includes the Acceptance Verification from the curation institution.</p>			
LAND USE (LND)				
No change in text.	No change to text.	No change in text.	No change in text.	No change in text.
	No change to text.			
	No change to text.			
	No change to text.			
	No change to text.			
NOISE (NOI)				
No change in text.	No change to text.	No change in text.	No change in text.	No change in text.

SIGNIFICANT IMPACT(S)	MITIGATION MEASURE(S)	IMPLEMENTATION TIME FRAME	IMPLEMENTATION RESPONSIBILITY	VERIFICATION RESPONSIBILITY
No change in text.	No change to text.	No change in text.	No change in text.	No change in text.
No change in text.	No change to text.	No change in text.	No change in text.	No change in text.
No change in text.	No change to text.	No change in text.	No change in text.	No change in text.
No change in text.	No change to text.	No change in text.	No change in text.	No change in text.

SIGNIFICANT IMPACT(S)	MITIGATION MEASURE(S)	IMPLEMENTATION TIME FRAME	IMPLEMENTATION RESPONSIBILITY	VERIFICATION RESPONSIBILITY
PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES (PAL)				
<p>Impact PAL-A.1: Excavation in geologic formations with a moderate to high potential for paleontological resources could have an significant impact on these resources, if present. (Direct)</p>	<p><i>Mitigation Measure PAL-A.1-1:</i> In the event the Secondary Study indicates the potential for significant paleontological resources, the following measures shall be implemented as determined appropriate by CCDC.</p> <p>I. Prior to Permit Issuance</p> <p>A. Construction Plan Check</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prior to Notice to Proceed (NTP) for any construction permits, including but not limited to, the first Grading Permit, Demolition Permits and Building Permits, but prior to the first preconstruction meeting, whichever is applicable, Centre City Development Corporation (CCDC) shall verify that the requirements for Paleontological Monitoring have been noted on the appropriate construction documents. <p>B. Letters of Qualification have been submitted to CCDC</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The applicant shall submit a letter of verification to CCDC identifying the Principal Investigator (PI) for the project and the names of all persons involved in the paleontological monitoring program, as defined in the City of San Diego Paleontology Guidelines. 2. CCDC will provide a letter to the applicant confirming the qualifications of the PI and all persons involved in the paleontological monitoring of the project. 3. Prior to the start of work, the applicant shall obtain approval from CCDC for any personnel changes associated with the monitoring program. <p>II. Prior to Start of Construction</p> <p>A. Verification of Records Search</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The PI shall provide verification to CCDC that a site-specific records search has been completed. Verification includes, but is not limited to a copy of a confirmation letter from San Diego Natural History Museum, other institution 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. 			

SIGNIFICANT IMPACT(S)	MITIGATION MEASURE(S)	IMPLEMENTATION TIME FRAME	IMPLEMENTATION RESPONSIBILITY	VERIFICATION RESPONSIBILITY
	<p>B. PI Shall Attend Precon Meetings</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prior to beginning any work that requires monitoring, the Applicant shall arrange a Precon Meeting that shall include the PI, Construction Manager (CM) and/or Grading Contractor, Resident Engineer (RE), Building Inspector (BI), if appropriate, and CCDC. The qualified paleontologist shall attend any grading/excavation related Precon Meetings to make comments and/or suggestions concerning the Paleontological Monitoring program with the Construction Manager and/or Grading Contractor. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. If the PI is unable to attend the Precon Meeting, the Applicant shall schedule a focused Precon Meeting with CCDC, the PI, RE, CM or BI, if appropriate, prior to the start of any work that requires monitoring. 2. Identify Areas to be Monitored <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Prior to the start of any work that requires monitoring, the PI shall submit a Paleontological Monitoring Exhibit (PME) based on the appropriate construction documents (reduced to 11x17) to CCDC identifying the areas to be monitored including the delineation of grading/excavation limits. The PME 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 <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Prior to the start of any work, the PI shall also submit a construction schedule to CCDC through the RE indicating when and where monitoring will occur. b. The PI may submit a detailed letter to CCDC 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 conditions such as depth of excavation and/or site graded to bedrock, presence or absence of fossil resources, etc., which may reduce or increase the potential for resources to be present. <p>III. During Construction</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> A. Monitor Shall be Present During Grading/Excavation/Trenching <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The monitor shall be present full-time during 			

SIGNIFICANT IMPACT(S)	MITIGATION MEASURE(S)	IMPLEMENTATION TIME FRAME	IMPLEMENTATION RESPONSIBILITY	VERIFICATION RESPONSIBILITY
	<p>grading/excavation/trenching activities as identified on the PME that could result in impacts to formations with high and moderate resource sensitivity. The Construction Manager is responsible for notifying the RE, PI, and CCDC of changes to any construction activities.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. The monitor shall document field activity via the Consultant Site Visit Record (CSV). The CSV's shall be faxed 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 CCDC. 3. The PI may submit a detailed letter to CCDC during construction requesting a modification to the monitoring program when a field condition such as trenching activities that do not encounter formational soils as previously assumed, and/or when unique/unusual fossils are encountered, which may reduce or increase the potential for resources to be present. <p>B. Discovery Notification Process</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In the event of a discovery, the Paleontological Monitor shall direct the contractor to temporarily divert trenching activities in the area of discovery 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 CCDC by phone of the discovery, and shall also submit written documentation to CCDC within 24 hours by fax or email with photos of the resource in context, if possible. <p>C. Determination of Significance</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The PI shall evaluate the significance of the resource. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The PI shall immediately notify CCDC by phone to discuss significance determination and shall also submit a letter to CCDC indicating whether additional mitigation is required. The determination of significance for fossil discoveries shall be at the discretion of the PI. b. If the resource is significant, the PI shall submit a Paleontological Recovery Program (PRP) and obtain written approval from CCDC. Impacts to significant resources must be mitigated before ground disturbing activities in the area of discovery will be allowed to resume. c. If resource is not significant (e.g., small pieces of broken 			

SIGNIFICANT IMPACT(S)	MITIGATION MEASURE(S)	IMPLEMENTATION TIME FRAME	IMPLEMENTATION RESPONSIBILITY	VERIFICATION RESPONSIBILITY
	<p>common shell fragments or other scattered common fossils) the PI shall notify the RE, or BI as appropriate, that a non-significant discovery has been made. The Paleontologist shall continue to monitor the area without notification to CCDC unless a significant resource is encountered.</p> <p>d. The PI shall submit a letter to CCDC indicating that fossil resources will be collected, curated, and documented in the Final Monitoring Report. The letter shall also indicate that no further work is required.</p> <p>IV. Night Work</p> <p>A. If night work is included in the contract</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. When night 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. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. No Discoveries <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) In the event that no discoveries were encountered during night work, The PI shall record the information on the CSVr and submit to CCDC via fax by 9am the following morning, if possible. b. Discoveries <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) All discoveries shall be processed and documented using the existing procedures detailed in Sections III - During Construction. c. Potentially Significant Discoveries <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) If the PI determines that a potentially significant discovery has been made, the procedures detailed under Section III - During Construction shall be followed. d. The PI shall immediately contact CCDC, or by 8AM the following morning to report and discuss the findings as indicated in Section III-B, unless other specific arrangements have been made. <p>B. If night work becomes necessary during the course of construction</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 CCDC immediately. <p>C. All other procedures described above shall apply, as appropriate.</p>			

SIGNIFICANT IMPACT(S)	MITIGATION MEASURE(S)	IMPLEMENTATION TIME FRAME	IMPLEMENTATION RESPONSIBILITY	VERIFICATION RESPONSIBILITY
	<p>VI. Post Construction</p> <p>A. Submittal of Draft Monitoring Report</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The PI shall submit two copies of the Draft Monitoring Report (even if negative) which describes the results, analysis, and conclusions of all phases of the Paleontological Monitoring Program (with appropriate graphics) to CCDC for review and approval within 90 days following the completion of monitoring, <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. For significant paleontological resources encountered during monitoring, the Paleontological Recovery Program shall be included in the Draft Monitoring Report. b. Recording Sites with the San Diego Natural History Museum <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) The PI shall be responsible for recording (on the appropriate forms) any significant or potentially significant fossil resources encountered during the Paleontological Monitoring Program in accordance with the City's Paleontological Guidelines, and submittal of such forms to the San Diego Natural History Museum with the Final Monitoring Report. 2. CCDC 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 CCDC for approval. 4. CCDC shall provide written verification to the PI of the approved report. 5. CCDC shall notify the RE or BI, as appropriate, of receipt of all Draft Monitoring Report submittals and approvals. <p>B. Handling of Fossil Remains</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The PI shall be responsible for ensuring that all fossil remains collected are cleaned and catalogued. 2. The PI shall be responsible for ensuring that all fossil remains are analyzed to identify function and chronology as they relate to the geologic history of the area; that faunal material is identified as to species; and that specialty studies are completed, as appropriate <p>C. Curation of fossil remains: Deed of Gift and Acceptance Verification</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The PI shall be responsible for ensuring that all fossil remains associated with the monitoring for this project are permanently curated with an appropriate institution. 2. The PI shall include the Acceptance Verification from the 			

SIGNIFICANT IMPACT(S)	MITIGATION MEASURE(S)	IMPLEMENTATION TIME FRAME	IMPLEMENTATION RESPONSIBILITY	VERIFICATION RESPONSIBILITY
	<p>curation institution in the Final Monitoring Report submitted to the RE or BI and CCDC.</p> <p>D. Final Monitoring Report(s)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The PI shall submit two copies of the Final Monitoring Report to CCDC (even if negative), within 90 days after notification from CCDC that the draft report has been approved. 2. The RE shall, in no case, issue the Notice of Completion until receiving a copy of the approved Final Monitoring Report from CCDC which includes the Acceptance Verification from the curation institution. 			
TRAFFIC AND CIRCULATION (TRF)				
No change to text.	No change to text.	No change to text.	No change to text.	No change to text.
No change to text.	No change to text.	No change to text.	No change to text.	No change to text.
No change to text.	No change to text.	No change to text.	No change to text.	No change to text.
No change to text.	No change to text.	No change to text.	No change to text.	No change to text.
No change to text.	No change to text.	No change to text.	No change to text.	No change to text.
No change to text.	No change to text.	No change to text.	No change to text.	No change to text.
No change to text.	No change to text.	No change to text.	No change to text.	No change to text.

Document comparison done by DeltaView on Thursday, June 18, 2009 1:35:35 PM

Input:	
Document 1	file://L:/Fain, Nina/DTCP Marina and Centre City PDO/MMRP Docs/ORIGINAL 2006 FEIR MMRP.doc
Document 2	file://L:/Fain, Nina/DTCP Marina and Centre City PDO/MMRP Docs/Revised MMRP.doc
Rendering set	Standard

Legend:	
Insertion	
Deletion	
Moved from	
Moved to	
Style change	
Format change	
Moved deletion	
Inserted cell	
Deleted cell	
Moved cell	
Split/Merged cell	
Padding cell	

Statistics:	
	Count
Insertions	234
Deletions	154
Moved from	2
Moved to	2
Style change	0
Format changed	0
Total changes	392