



THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO

## MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Project No. 640358

SCH No. N/A

**SUBJECT:** **EPB Residence Remodel CDP:** The project requests a Coastal Development Permit (CDP) to remodel an existing 968-square foot single-family residence and construct a second-story addition resulting in a total of 2,889-square-feet, located at 2275 Via Aprilia. The 0.11-acre site is located within the Torrey Pine Community Planning area, designated Low Density Residential and is subject to the RS-1-7 zoning requirements. The project is also subject to the Coastal (Non-Appealable) Overlay Zone, Coastal Height Limitation Overlay Zone, and Council District 1. (LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Northwesterly 65 feet of lots 12 and 13 of Del mar Terrace, Map No. 1527).

I. PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

See attached Initial Study.

II. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING:

See attached Initial Study.

III. DETERMINATION:

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

IV. DOCUMENTATION:

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

V. MITIGATION, MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM:



**A. GENERAL REQUIREMENTS – PART I**

**Plan Check Phase (prior to permit issuance)**

1. Prior to the issuance of a Notice To Proceed (NTP) for a subdivision, or any construction permits, such as Demolition, Grading or Building, or beginning any construction related activity on-site, the Development Services Department (DSD) Director's Environmental Designee (ED) shall review and approve all Construction Documents (CD), (plans, specification, details, etc.) to ensure the MMRP requirements are incorporated into the design.

2. In addition, the ED shall verify that the MMRP Conditions/Notes that apply ONLY to the construction phases of this project are included VERBATIM, under the heading, **"ENVIRONMENTAL/MITIGATION REQUIREMENTS."**

3. These notes must be shown within the first three (3) sheets of the construction documents in the format specified for engineering construction document templates as shown on the City website:

<https://www.sandiego.gov/development-services/forms-publications/design-guidelines-templates>

4. The **TITLE INDEX SHEET** must also show on which pages the "Environmental/Mitigation Requirements" notes are provided.

5. **SURETY AND COST RECOVERY** – The Development Services Director or City Manager may require appropriate surety instruments or bonds from private Permit Holders to ensure the long-term performance or implementation of required mitigation measures or programs. The City is authorized to recover its cost to offset the salary, overhead, and expenses for City personnel and programs to monitor qualifying projects.

**B. GENERAL REQUIREMENTS – PART II**

**Post Plan Check (After permit issuance/Prior to start of construction)**

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

***Qualified Archaeologist***

***Qualified Native American Monitor***

**Note: Failure of all responsible Permit Holder's representatives and consultants to attend shall require an additional meeting with all parties present.**

CONTACT INFORMATION:



a) The PRIMARY POINT OF CONTACT is the **RE** at the **Field Engineering Division – 858-627-3200**

b) For Clarification of ENVIRONMENTAL REQUIREMENTS, it is also required to call **RE and MMC at 858-627-3360**

- 2. MMRP COMPLIANCE:** This Project, Project Tracking System (PTS) #640358 and /or Environmental Document #640358, shall conform to the mitigation requirements contained in the associated Environmental Document and implemented to the satisfaction of the DSD's Environmental Designee (MMC) and the City Engineer (RE). The requirements may not be reduced or changed but may be annotated (i.e. to explain when and how compliance is being met and location of verifying proof, etc.). Additional clarifying information may also be added to other relevant plan sheets and/or specifications as appropriate (i.e., specific locations, times of monitoring, methodology, etc.

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

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

***None Required***

**4. MONITORING EXHIBITS**

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

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

**5. OTHER SUBMITTALS AND INSPECTIONS:**

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



<b>Document Submittal/Inspection Checklist</b>		
<b>Issue Area</b>	<b>Document Submittal</b>	<b>Associated Inspection/Approvals/Notes</b>
General	Consultant Qualification Letters	Prior to Preconstruction Meeting
General	Consultant Construction Monitoring Exhibits	Prior to Preconstruction Meeting
Cultural Resources (Archaeology)	Monitoring Report(s)	Archaeology/Historic Site Observation
Bond Release	Request for Bond Release Letter	Final MMRP Inspections Prior to Bond Release Letter

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

### **HISTORICAL RESOURCES ARCHAEOLOGICAL and NATIVE AMERICAN MONITORING**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



probabilities of discovery during trenching and/or grading activities.

3. The PI may submit a detailed letter to MMC requesting a reduction to the ¼ mile radius.

**B. PI Shall Attend Precon Meetings**

1. Prior to beginning any work that requires monitoring; the Applicant shall arrange a Precon Meeting that shall include the PI, Native American consultant/monitor (where Native American resources may be impacted), Construction Manager (CM) and/or Grading Contractor, Resident Engineer (RE), Building Inspector (BI), if appropriate, and MMC. The qualified Archaeologist and Native American Monitor shall attend any grading/excavation related Precon Meetings to make comments and/or suggestions concerning the Archaeological Monitoring program with the Construction Manager and/or Grading Contractor.
  - a. If the PI is unable to attend the Precon Meeting, the Applicant shall schedule a focused Precon Meeting with MMC, the PI, RE, CM or BI, if appropriate, prior to the start of any work that requires monitoring.

2. Identify Areas to be Monitored

Prior to the start of any work that requires monitoring, the PI shall submit an Archaeological Monitoring Exhibit (AME) (with verification that the AME has been reviewed and approved by the Native American consultant/monitor when Native American resources may be impacted) based on the appropriate construction documents (reduced to 11x17) to MMC identifying the areas to be monitored including the delineation of grading/excavation limits.

The AME shall be based on the results of a site-specific records search as well as information regarding existing known soil conditions (native or formation).

3. When Monitoring Will Occur

- a. Prior to the start of any work, the PI shall also submit a construction schedule to MMC through the RE indicating when and where monitoring will occur.
- b. The PI may submit a detailed letter to MMC prior to the start of work or during construction requesting a modification to the monitoring program. This request shall be based on relevant information such as review of final construction documents which indicate site conditions such as depth of excavation and/or site graded to bedrock, etc., which may reduce or increase the potential for resources to be present.

### **III. During Construction**

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

1. The Archaeological Monitor shall be present full-time during all soil disturbing and grading/excavation/trenching activities which could result in impacts to archaeological resources as identified on the AME. The Construction Manager is responsible for notifying the RE, PI, and MMC of changes to any construction activities such as in the case of a potential safety concern within the area being monitored. In certain circumstances OSHA safety requirements may necessitate modification of the AME.
2. The Native American consultant/monitor shall determine the extent of their presence during soil disturbing and grading/excavation/trenching activities based on the AME and provide that information to the PI and MMC. If prehistoric resources are encountered during the Native American consultant/monitor's absence, work shall



stop and the Discovery Notification Process detailed in Section III.B-C and IV.A-D shall commence.

3. The PI may submit a detailed letter to MMC during construction requesting a modification to the monitoring program when a field condition such as modern disturbance post-dating the previous grading/trenching activities, presence of fossil formations, or when native soils are encountered that may reduce or increase the potential for resources to be present.
  4. The archaeological and Native American consultant/monitor shall document field activity via the Consultant Site Visit Record (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 MMC.
- B. Discovery Notification Process
1. In the event of a discovery, the Archaeological Monitor shall direct the contractor to temporarily divert all soil disturbing activities, including but not limited to digging, trenching, excavating or grading activities in the area of discovery and in the area reasonably suspected to overlay adjacent resources and immediately notify the RE or BI, as appropriate.
  2. The Monitor shall immediately notify the PI (unless Monitor is the PI) of the discovery.
  3. The PI shall immediately notify MMC by phone of the discovery, and shall also submit written documentation to MMC within 24 hours by fax or email with photos of the resource in context, if possible.
  4. No soil shall be exported off-site until a determination can be made regarding the significance of the resource specifically if Native American resources are encountered.
- C. Determination of Significance
1. The PI and Native American consultant/monitor, where Native American resources are discovered shall evaluate the significance of the resource. If Human Remains are involved, follow protocol in Section IV below.
    - a. The PI shall immediately notify MMC by phone to discuss significance determination and shall also submit a letter to MMC indicating whether additional mitigation is required.
    - b. If the resource is significant, the PI shall submit an Archaeological Data Recovery Program (ADRP) which has been reviewed by the Native American consultant/monitor, and obtain written approval from MMC. Impacts to significant resources must be mitigated before ground disturbing activities in the area of discovery will be allowed to resume. Note: If a unique archaeological site is also an historical resource as defined in CEQA, then the limits on the amount(s) that a project applicant may be required to pay to cover mitigation costs as indicated in CEQA Section 21083.2 shall not apply.
    - c. If the resource is not significant, the PI shall submit a letter to MMC indicating that artifacts will be collected, curated, and documented in the Final Monitoring Report. The letter shall also indicate that that no further work is required.

#### **IV. Discovery of Human Remains**

If human remains are discovered, work shall halt in that area and no soil shall be exported



off-site until a determination can be made regarding the provenance of the human remains; and the following procedures as set forth in CEQA Section 15064.5(e), the California Public Resources Code (Sec. 5097.98) and State Health and Safety Code (Sec. 7050.5) shall be undertaken:

A. Notification

1. Archaeological Monitor shall notify the RE or BI as appropriate, MMC, and the PI, if the Monitor is not qualified as a PI. MMC will notify the appropriate Senior Planner in the Environmental Analysis Section (EAS) of the Development Services Department to assist with the discovery notification process.
2. The PI shall notify the Medical Examiner after consultation with the RE, either in person or via telephone.

B. Isolate discovery site

1. Work shall be directed away from the location of the discovery and any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlay adjacent human remains until a determination can be made by the Medical Examiner in consultation with the PI concerning the provenance of the remains.
2. The Medical Examiner, in consultation with the PI, will determine the need for a field examination to determine the provenance.
3. If a field examination is not warranted, the Medical Examiner will determine with input from the PI, if the remains are or are most likely to be of Native American origin.

C. If Human Remains ARE determined to be Native American

1. The Medical Examiner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) within 24 hours. By law, ONLY the Medical Examiner can make this call.
2. NAHC will immediately identify the person or persons determined to be the Most Likely Descendent (MLD) and provide contact information.
3. The MLD will contact the PI within 24 hours or sooner after the Medical Examiner has completed coordination, to begin the consultation process in accordance with CEQA Section 15064.5(e), the California Public Resources and Health & Safety Codes.
4. The MLD will have 48 hours to make recommendations to the property owner or representative, for the treatment or disposition with proper dignity, of the human remains and associated grave goods.
5. Disposition of Native American Human Remains will be determined between the MLD and the PI, and, if:
  - a. The NAHC is unable to identify the MLD, OR the MLD failed to make a recommendation within 48 hours after being notified by the Commission granted access to the site, OR;
  - b. The landowner or authorized representative rejects the recommendation of the MLD and mediation in accordance with PRC 5097.94 (k) by the NAHC fails to provide measures acceptable to the landowner, the landowner shall reinter the human remains and items associated with Native American human remains with appropriate dignity on the property in a location not subject to further and future subsurface disturbance, THEN
  - c. To protect these sites, the landowner shall do one or more of the following:
    - (1) Record the site with the NAHC;
    - (2) Record an open space or conservation easement; or
    - (3) Record a document with the County. The document shall be titled "Notice of



Reinterment of Native American Remains” and shall include a legal description of the property, the name of the property owner, and the owner’s acknowledged signature, in addition to any other information required by PRC 5097.98. The document shall be indexed as a notice under the name of the owner.

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

- A. If night and/or weekend work is included in the contract
  - 1. When night and/or weekend work is included in the contract package, the extent and timing shall be presented and discussed at the precon meeting.
  - 2. The following procedures shall be followed.
    - a. No Discoveries  
In the event that no discoveries were encountered during night and/or weekend work, the PI shall record the information on the CSVr and submit to MMC via fax by 8AM of the next business day.
    - b. Discoveries  
All discoveries shall be processed and documented using the existing procedures detailed in Sections III - During Construction, and IV – Discovery of Human Remains. Discovery of human remains shall always be treated as a significant discovery.
    - c. Potentially Significant Discoveries  
If the PI determines that a potentially significant discovery has been made, the procedures detailed under Section III - During Construction and IV-Discovery of Human Remains shall be followed.
    - d. The PI shall immediately contact MMC, or by 8AM of the next business day to report and discuss the findings as indicated in Section III-B, unless other specific arrangements have been made.
- B. If night and/or weekend work becomes necessary during the course of construction
  - 1. The Construction Manager shall notify the RE, or BI, as appropriate, a minimum of 24 hours before the work is to begin.
  - 2. The RE, or BI, as appropriate, shall notify MMC immediately.
- C. All other procedures described above shall apply, as appropriate.

**VI. Post Construction**

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



- b. Recording Sites with State of California Department of Parks and Recreation  
The PI shall be responsible for recording (on the appropriate State of California Department of Park and Recreation forms-DPR 523 A/B) any significant or potentially significant resources encountered during the Archaeological Monitoring Program in accordance with the City's Historical Resources Guidelines, and submittal of such forms to the South Coastal Information Center with the Final Monitoring Report.
2. MMC shall return the Draft Monitoring Report to the PI for revision or, for preparation of the Final Report.
3. The PI shall submit revised Draft Monitoring Report to MMC for approval.
4. MMC shall provide written verification to the PI of the approved report.
5. MMC shall notify the RE or BI, as appropriate, of receipt of all Draft Monitoring Report submittals and approvals.
- B. Handling of Artifacts
  1. The PI shall be responsible for ensuring that all cultural remains collected are cleaned and catalogued
  2. The PI shall be responsible for ensuring that all artifacts are analyzed to identify function and chronology as they relate to the history of the area; that faunal material is identified as to species; and that specialty studies are completed, as appropriate.
  3. The cost for curation is the responsibility of the property owner.
- C. Curation of artifacts: Accession Agreement and Acceptance Verification
  1. The PI shall be responsible for ensuring that all artifacts associated with the survey, testing and/or data recovery for this project are permanently curated with an appropriate institution. This shall be completed in consultation with MMC and the Native American representative, as applicable.
  2. The PI shall include the Acceptance Verification from the curation institution in the Final Monitoring Report submitted to the RE or BI and MMC.
  3. When applicable to the situation, the PI shall include written verification from the Native American consultant/monitor indicating that Native American resources were treated in accordance with state law and/or applicable agreements. If the resources were reinterred, verification shall be provided to show what protective measures were taken to ensure no further disturbance occurs in accordance with Section IV – Discovery of Human Remains, Subsection 5.
- D. Final Monitoring Report(s)
  1. The PI shall submit one copy of the approved Final Monitoring Report to the RE or BI as appropriate, and one copy to MMC (even if negative), within 90 days after notification from MMC that the draft report has been approved.
  2. The RE shall, in no case, issue the Notice of Completion and/or release of the Performance Bond for grading until receiving a copy of the approved Final Monitoring Report from MMC which includes the Acceptance Verification from the curation institution.



VI. PUBLIC REVIEW DISTRIBUTION:

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

CITY OF SAN DIEGO

Mayor's Office

Councilmember Barbara Bry - District 1

Development Services:

Development Project Manager

Environmental Review

Engineering Review

Planning Review

Plan-Historic

MMC (77A)

City Attorney's Office (93C)

OTHER ORGANIZATIONS AND INTERESTED PARTIES

Historical Resources Board (87)

Carmen Lucas (206)

South Coastal Information Center (210)

San Diego Archaeological Center (212)

Save Our Heritage Organization (214)

Ron Christman (215)

Clint Linton (215B)

Frank Brown – Inter-Tribal Cultural Resources Council (216)

Campo Band of Mission Indians (217)

San Diego County Archaeological Society, Inc. (218)

Kumeyaay Cultural Heritage Preservation (223)

Kumeyaay Cultural Repatriation Committee (225)

Torrey Pines Community Planning Board (469)

Torrey Pines Association (472)



VII. RESULTS OF PUBLIC REVIEW:

- ( ) No comments were received during the public input period.
- ( ) Comments were received but did not address the accuracy or completeness of the draft environmental document. No response is necessary and the letters are incorporated herein.
- (X) Comments addressing the accuracy or completeness of the draft environmental document were received during the public input period. The letters and responses are incorporated herein.

Copies of the draft Mitigated Negative Declaration, the Mitigation, Monitoring and Reporting Program and any Initial Study material are available in the office of the Development Services Department for review, or for purchase at the cost of reproduction.



Sara Osborn, AICP  
Senior Planner  
Development Services Department

5-7-2020

Date of Draft Report

6/9/2020

Date of Final Report

Analyst: Rachael Ferrell

Attachments: Comment Letter A  
Initial Study Checklist  
Figure 1 – Location Map  
Figure 2 – Site Plan



## Comment Letter A

## Response

1. Comment noted.



### San Diego County Archaeological Society, Inc.

Environmental Review Committee

28 May 2020

To: Ms. Rachael Ferrell  
Development Services Department  
City of San Diego  
1222 First Avenue, Mail Station 501  
San Diego, California 92101

Subject: Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration  
EPB Residence Remodel CDP  
Project No. 640358


Dear Ms. Ferrell:

I have reviewed the subject DMND on behalf of this committee of the San Diego County Archaeological Society.

1. Based on the information contained in the DMND, we concur with the cultural resources mitigation program as specified therein.

Thank you for including SDCAS in the City's environmental process for this project.

Sincerely,

  
James W. Royle, Jr., Chairperson  
Environmental Review Committee

cc: SDCAS President  
File



## INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

1. Project title/Project number: EPB Residence Remodel CDP / 640358
2. Lead agency name and address: City of San Diego, 1222 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue, San Diego, California 92101
3. Contact person and phone number: Rachael Ferrell / (619) 446-5129
4. Project location: 2275 Via Aprilia, San Diego, CA 92014
5. Project Applicant/Sponsor's name and address: Andy Darragh, 4499 Ruffinn Road, Ste 300, CA 92123, (619) 231-0751
6. General/Community Plan designation: Residential/ Low Residential (5-9 DU/AC)
7. Zoning: RS -1-7 (Residential Single Unit)
8. Description of project (Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to, later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation.):

The project requests a Coastal Development Permit (CDP) to remodel an existing 968-square foot single-family residence and construct a second-story addition resulting in a total of 2,889-square-feet. Various site improvements would also be constructed including associated hardscape and landscape.

The project's landscaping has been reviewed by staff and would comply with all applicable City of San Diego Landscape ordinances and standards. Drainage would be directed into appropriate storm drain systems designated to carry surface runoff, which has been reviewed and accepted by City Engineering staff. Ingress to the project site would be on Via Aprilia. All parking would be provided on-site.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting:

The 0.11-acre site is located at 2275 Via Aprilia. The land use designation is Low Density Residential (5-9 dwelling units per acre) per the Torrey Pines Community Plan and is located in the RS-1-7 Zone (Residential Single Unit) and is subject to the Coastal (Appealable) Overlay Zone and Coastal Height Limitation Overlay Zone.

The project site is currently developed with a single-family residence. The project site is situated West of Interstate 5, South of Del Mar Heights Road, and North of Carmel Valley Road. Vegetation on-site is varied and consists of non-native landscaping flora. The project is located in a residential neighborhood of similar development.

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

List or None required.



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

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

In accordance with the requirements of Assembly Bill (AB) 52, the City of San Diego sent Notifications via email September 5, 2019 to two Native American Tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area. No response was received from either the Lipay Nation of Santa Ysabel or the Jamul Indian Village within the 30-day period to request for consultation. Therefore, consultation was not opened and did not take place. Please see Section XVII of the Initial Study for more detail.



**ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:**

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

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

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

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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



## EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

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



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

I. AESTHETICS – Would the project:

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

There are no public view corridors or any designated scenic roadways on or directly adjacent to the project site that must be protected, therefore, public views would not be affected with project implementation. Therefore, impacts would not result.

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

The project is situated within a developed residential neighborhood. The project is not located within or adjacent to a state scenic highway, nor does it contain any scenic resources. Therefore, no impacts would result.

- |   |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The project site is located in a neighborhood of similar residential development and is currently developed with a single-family residence. The project is compatible with the surrounding development and permitted by the community plan and zoning designation. The project would not degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings; therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

The project would comply with Municipal Code Section 142.0730 (Glare Regulations) that requires exterior materials utilized for proposed structures be limited to specific reflectivity ratings. The structure would be constructed with non-reflective materials. The project would have a less than significant glare impact.

- II. AGRICULTURAL AND FOREST RESOURCES: In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment



Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. – Would the project:				
a) Converts Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The project is consistent with the community plan's land use designation and is located within a developed residential neighborhood. As such, the project site does not contain, and is not adjacent to, any lands identified as Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as show on maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resource Agency. Therefore, the project would not result in the conversion of such lands to non-agricultural use. No significant impacts would occur, and no mitigation measures are required.

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

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

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

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

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

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

e) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------



Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				

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

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

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

The San Diego Air Pollution Control District (SDAPCD) and San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) are responsible for developing and implementing the clean air plan for attainment and maintenance of the ambient air quality standards in the San Diego Air Basin (SDAB). The County Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) was initially adopted in 1991, and is updated on a triennial basis (most recently in 2009). The RAQS outlines the SDAPCD's plans and control measures designed to attain the state air quality standards for ozone (O3). The RAQS relies on information from the California Air Resources Board (CARB) and SANDAG, including mobile and area source emissions, as well as information regarding projected growth in San Diego County and the cities in the county, to project future emissions and then determine the strategies necessary for the reduction of emissions through regulatory controls. CARB mobile source emission projections and SANDAG growth projections are based on population, vehicle trends, and land use plans developed by San Diego County and the cities in the county as part of the development of their general plans.

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

The project would remodel and construct an addition to an existing single-family residence within a developed neighborhood of similar residential uses. The project is consistent with the General Plan, community plan, and the underlying zoning for single-family residential development. Therefore, the project would be consistent at a sub-regional level with the underlying growth forecasts in the RAQS and would not obstruct implementation of the RAQS. As such, no impacts would result.

- |  |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

#### Short-Term (Construction) Emissions

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



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

equipment exhaust; construction-related trips by workers, delivery trucks, and material-hauling trucks; and construction-related power consumption.

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

Fugitive dust emissions are generally associated with land-clearing and grading operations. Construction operations would include standard measures as required by City of San Diego grading permit to limit potential air quality impacts. Any impacts associated with fugitive dust are considered less than significant and would not violate an air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. No mitigation measures are required.

#### Long-Term (Operational) Emissions

Long-term air emission impacts are those associated with stationary sources and mobile sources related to any change caused by a project. The project would produce minimal stationary sources emissions. The project is compatible with the surrounding development and is permitted by the community plan and zone designation. Based on the residential land use, project emissions over the long-term are not anticipated to violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

As described above, construction operations could temporarily increase the emissions of dust and other pollutants. However, construction emissions would be temporary and short-term in duration; implementation of Best Management Practices (BMPs) would reduce potential impacts related to construction activities to a less than significant level. Therefore, the project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is a nonattainment under applicable federal or state ambient air quality standards. Impacts would be less than significant.



Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

#### Short-term (Construction)

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

#### Long-term (Operational)

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

#### IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Have substantial adverse effects, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The project site is located in a developed residential neighborhood and is currently developed with a single-family residence. On-site landscaping is non-native, and the project site does not contain any sensitive biological resources nor does it contain any candidate, sensitive or special status species. No impacts would occur, and no mitigation measures are required.

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The project site is within an urbanized developed residential setting, no such habitats exist on or near the project site. Refer to Response IV (a), above. The project site does not contain any riparian habitat or other identified community, as the site currently supports non-native landscaping. No impacts would occur, and no mitigation measures are required.

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including but not limited to marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|



Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				

The project site is currently developed with a single-family residence and contains some hardscape and landscape within an urban setting. Additionally, there are no wetlands or water of the United States on or near the site. No impacts would occur, and no mitigation measures are required.

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The project site is surrounded by existing residential development and is not located adjacent to an established wildlife corridor and would not impede the movement of any wildlife or the use of any wildlife nursery sites. Therefore, no impact would occur, and no mitigation measures are required.

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Refer to response IV (a), above. The project site is designated Low Density Residential pursuant to the Torrey Pines Community Plan and zoned RS-1-7. The project is located on a developed residential site and there are no local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources that apply to the project site. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

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

The project is located in a developed urban area and is not within or directly adjacent to the City's Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA) and no other adopted conservation plans affect the subject site. The project would not conflict with any local conservation plans. Therefore, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are required.

#### V. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

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

The purpose and intent of the Historical Resources Regulations of the Land Development Code (Chapter 14, Division 3, and Article 2) is to protect, preserve and, where damaged, restore the historical resources of San Diego. The regulations apply to all proposed development within the City of San Diego when historical resources are present on the premises. Before approving discretionary projects, CEQA requires the Lead Agency to identify and examine the significant adverse environmental effects which may result from that project. A project that may cause a substantial



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

adverse change in the significance of a historical resource may have a significant effect on the environment (sections 15064.5(b) and 21084.1). A substantial adverse change is defined as demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration activities, which would impair historical significance (sections 15064.5(b)(1)). Any historical resource listed in, or eligible to be listed in the California Register of Historical Resources, including archaeological resources, is considered to be historically or culturally significant.

The City of San Diego criteria for determination of historic significance, pursuant to CEQA, is evaluated based upon age (over 45 years), location, context, association with an important event, uniqueness, or structural integrity of the building. Projects requiring the demolition and/or modification of structures that are 45 years or older have the potential to result in potential impacts to a historical resource.

The project site contains a single-family residence over 45 years old. The project site was reviewed by Historic staff and according to their review, the property does not meet the local designation criteria as an individually significant resource under any of the adopted Historical Resource Board criteria. Their determination was made on August 6, 2019 and is good for five years. As such, any impacts would be less than significant.

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

Many areas of San Diego County, including mesas and the coast, are known for intense and diverse prehistoric occupation and important archaeological and historical resources. The region has been inhabited by various cultural groups spanning 10,000 years or more. The project area is located within an area identified as sensitive on the City of San Diego's Historical Resources Sensitivity Maps.

Therefore, a record search of the California Historic Resources Information System (CHRIS) digital database was reviewed to determine presence or absence of potential resources within the project site by qualified archaeological City staff. Previously recorded historic and prehistoric sites have been identified in the near project vicinity.

Qualified City staff evaluated the scope of work and due to the expansion of the building footprint and the proposed grading of 200-cubic yards to a depth of 3 feet, the City determined that any ground disturbing activities in this location could have the potential to impact any unknown buried resources to a significant level.

A Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, as detailed within Section V of the Mitigated Negative Declaration would be implemented to reduce impacts related to Historical Resources (archaeology) to below a level of significance.

- |   |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

According to the "Geology of the San Diego Metropolitan Area, California, Del Mar, 7.5 Minute Quadrangle Maps" (Kennedy and Peterson, 1975) the project site is underlain with the highly

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

sensitive Bay Point formation, which has a probability of containing important paleontological resources. The City's Significance Determination Thresholds state paleontological monitoring during grading activities may be required if it is determined that the project's earth movement quantity exceeds the Paleontological threshold (if greater than 1,000 cubic yards and ten feet deep for formations with a high sensitivity rating and if greater than 2,000 cubic yards and ten feet deep for formations with a moderate sensitivity rating). The project does not propose any grading activities which would exceed 1,000 cubic yards in a highly sensitive formation. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

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

- |  |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:   |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
| i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

The project is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Fault Zone. The project would be required to comply with seismic requirement of the California Building Code, utilize proper engineering design and utilization of standard construction practices, to be verified at the building permit stage, in order to ensure that potential impacts based on regional geologic hazards would remain less than significant.

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

The site could be affected by seismic activity as a result of earthquakes on major active faults located throughout the Southern California area. The project would utilize proper engineering design and utilization of standard construction practices, to be verified at the building permit stage, in order to ensure that potential impacts from regional geologic hazards would remain less than significant.



Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Liquefaction generally occurs when loose, unconsolidated, water-laden soils are subject to shaking, causing the soils to lose cohesion. The potential for soil liquefaction at the subject site is low due to the geologic structure and the Geologic Hazard Category Designation 53. The project would be required to comply with the California Building Code that would reduce impacts to people or structures to an acceptable level of risk. Implementation of proper engineering design and utilization of standard construction practices, to be verified at the building permit stage, would ensure that the potential for impacts from regional geologic hazards would remain less than significant.

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

The project site is level. The possibility of deep-seated slope stability problems at the site is low. Implementation of proper engineering design and utilization of standard construction practices, to be verified at the building permit stage, would ensure that the potential for impacts would be reduced to an acceptable level of risk. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

As discussed in Section VI (a) and VI (b), the project site is not likely to be subject to landslides, and the potential for liquefaction and subsidence is low. The soils and geologic units underlying the site are considered to have a "low" expansion potential. The project design would be required to comply with the requirements of the California Building Code, ensuring hazards associated with expansive soils would be reduced to an acceptable level of risk. As such, impacts due to expansive soils are expected to be less than significant.

d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

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

The project site is considered to have very low expansive soil potential. The project would be required to comply with seismic requirements of the California Building Code that would reduce impacts to people or structures due to local seismic events to an acceptable level of risk. Implementation of proper engineering design and utilization of standard construction practices, to be verified at the building permit stage, would ensure that the potential for impacts from regional geologic hazards would remain less than significant.

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The project site is located within an area that is already developed with existing infrastructure (i.e., water and sewer lines) and does not propose any septic system. In addition, the project does not require the construction of any new facilities as it relates to wastewater, as services are available to serve the project. No impact would occur.

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

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

The City's Climate Action Plan (CAP) outlines the actions that the City will undertake to achieve its proportional share of State greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reductions. A CAP Consistency Checklist is part of the CAP and contains measures that are required to be implemented on a project-by-project basis to ensure that the specified emission targets identified in the CAP are achieved. The project is consistent with the General Plan and Community Plan land use and zoning designations with allowable deviations. Further based upon review and evaluation of the completed CAP Consistency Checklist, the project is consistent with the applicable strategies and actions of the CAP.

Based on the project's consistency with the City's CAP Checklist, the project's contribution of GHG's to cumulative statewide emissions would be less than cumulatively considerable. Therefore, the projects direct and cumulative GHG emissions would have a less than significant impact.

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

The project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purposes of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gasses. The project is consistent with the existing General Plan and Community Plan land use and zoning designations. Further based upon review and evaluation of the completed CAP Consistency Checklist for the project, the project is consistent with the applicable strategies and actions of the CAP. Therefore, the project is consistent with the assumptions for relevant CAP strategies toward achieving the identified GHG reduction targets. Impacts are considered less than significant.



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

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Would the project:

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

The project would construct a single-family residence. Although minimal amounts of such substances may be present during construction, they are not anticipated to create a significant public hazard. Once constructed, due to the nature of the project, the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials on or through the subject site is not anticipated. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

- |   |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Refer to response VIII (a) above. Impacts would be less than significant.

- |   |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Refer to response VIII (a) above. The project site is not within one quarter mile of a school. Future risk of releases of hazardous substances would not occur as a result of project operations because it is anticipated that future on-site operations would not require the routine use or transport of acutely hazardous materials. Construction of the project may require the use of hazardous materials (fuels, lubricants, solvents, etc.), which would require proper storage, handling, use and disposal. Further, the project would be required to comply with all federal, state and local requirements associated with hazardous materials; therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

A hazardous waste site record search was completed in August 2019 using Geo Tracker, an online website which discloses any type of hazardous clean-up site pursuant to Government Code section 65962.5: <http://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/> The records search identified that no hazardous waste sites exist onsite or in the surrounding area. No Impacts would result.

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two mile of a | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				

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

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Refer to response VII (e) above. The project site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip, nor would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area. No impacts would result.

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

The project would not impair the implementation of, or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or evacuation plan. No roadway improvements are proposed that would interfere with circulation or access, and all construction would take place on-site. No impacts would result.

- |  |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The project is located within a developed residential neighborhood that is adjacent to open space with a high fire severity rating. The project would be conditioned to use building materials that would mitigate the risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

#### IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY - Would the project:

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

The project would comply with the City's Storm Water Regulations during and after construction, and appropriate best management practices (BMP's) would be utilized. Implementation of project specific BMP's would preclude violations of any existing water quality standards or discharge requirements. Impacts would be less than significant.



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

The project does not require the construction of wells or the use of groundwater. Furthermore, the project would not introduce significant new impervious surfaces that could interfere with groundwater recharge, as the site is already developed with impervious surfaces. Therefore, the project would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge. The project is located in an urban neighborhood where all infrastructures exist. The project would connect to the existing public water system. No impact would result.

c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner, which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or the area. There are no streams or rivers located on-site and thus, no such resources would be impacted through the proposed construction activities. The project would be required to implement BMPs to ensure that substantial erosion or siltation on or off-site would not occur. Impacts would be less than significant.

d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner, which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The project would not alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or significantly alter runoff volumes. The project would not substantially alter the impervious area and runoff would continue to be discharged into the storm drain system. Thus, the project would not significantly alter the overall drainage pattern for the site or area, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site. Impacts would be less than significant.

e) Create or contribute runoff water, which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The project would be required to comply with all City storm water standards during and after construction. Appropriate BMPs would be implemented to ensure that water quality is not

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

degraded; therefore, ensuring that project runoff is directed to appropriate drainage systems. Any runoff from the site is not anticipated to exceed the capacity of existing storm water systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

- |   |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Refer to Section IX (a). The project would be required to comply with all City storm water standards both during and after construction, using appropriate BMP's that would ensure that water quality is not degraded. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The project site is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area or any other known flood area. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area, structures that would impede or redirect flood flows? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The project site is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area or any other known flood area. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING – Would the project:

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

The project is inclusive of a remodel and construction of an addition to a single-family residence. The project is consistent with the General Plan's and Community Plan's land use designation. The project site is located within a developed residential neighborhood and surrounded by similar residential development. The project would not substantially change the nature of the surrounding area and would not introduce any barriers or project features that could physically divide the community. No impacts would result.

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Refer to response X (a). No impacts would result.



Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The project is located within a developed residential neighborhood and would not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. The project would not conflict with the City's Multiple Species Conservation Plan (MSCP). The site is not located within or adjacent to the Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA). No significant impacts would occur, and no mitigation measures are required.

#### XI. MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

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

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

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

#### XII. NOISE – Would the project result in:

- |  |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Generation of, noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

#### Short-term (Construction)

Short-term noise impacts would be associated with onsite grading, and construction activities of the project. Construction-related short-term noise levels would be higher than existing ambient noise levels in the project area but would no longer occur once construction is completed. Sensitive receptors (e.g. residential uses) occur in the immediate area and may be temporarily affected by construction noise; however, construction activities would be required to comply with the construction hours specified in the City's Municipal Code (Section 59.5.0404, Construction Noise) which are intended to reduce potential adverse effects resulting from construction noise. With compliance to the City's noise ordinance, project construction noise levels would be reduced to less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

#### Long-term (Operation)

For the long-term, typical noise levels associated with residential uses are anticipated, and the

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

project would not result in an increase in the existing ambient noise level. The project would not result in noise levels in excess of standards established in the City of San Diego General Plan or Noise Ordinance. No significant long-term impacts would occur, and no mitigation measures are required.

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

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

- |  |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The project would not significantly increase long-term (ambient) noise levels. The project would not introduce a new land use or significantly increase the intensity of the allowed land use. Post construction noise levels and traffic would be generally unchanged as compared to noise with the existing residential use. Therefore, no substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels is anticipated. Impacts would be less than significant.

- |   |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above existing without the project? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The project would not expose people to a substantial increase in temporary or periodic ambient noise levels. Construction noise would result during construction activities but would be temporary in nature. Construction-related noise impacts from the project would generally be higher than existing ambient noise levels in the project area but would no longer occur once construction is completed. In addition, the project would be required to comply with the San Diego Municipal Code, Article 9.5 "Noise Abatement and Control." Implementation of these standard measures would reduce potential impacts from an increase in ambient noise level during construction to a less than significant level.

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

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

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|



Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				

The project site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. No impacts would result.

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

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The project site is located in a developed residential neighborhood and is surrounded by similar residential development. The project site is currently developed with the connections to receive water and sewer service from the City, and no extension of infrastructure to new areas is required. As such, the project would not substantially increase housing or population growth in the area. No roadway improvements are proposed as part of the project. No impacts would result.

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

The project is inclusive of construction of a new single-family residence on a vacant lot, located in a neighborhood of similar residential development; therefore, no such displacement would occur. No impacts would result.

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

Refer to response XIII (b) above. No impacts would result.

### XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES

- |   |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provisions of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service rations, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services: |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
| i) Fire protection  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

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

- |                       |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| ii) Police protection | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

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

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

iii) Schools	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

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

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

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

v) Other public facilities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
----------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The project site is located in an urbanized and developed area where City services are already available. The project would not adversely affect existing levels of public services and not require the construction or expansion of an existing governmental facility. Therefore, no new public facilities beyond existing conditions would be required. Impacts would be less than significant.

#### XV. RECREATION

a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

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

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Refer to XV (a) above. The project does not propose recreation facilities nor require the construction or expansion of any such facilities. As such, impacts would remain less than significant.

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC – Would the project?

a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Construction of the project would not substantially alter existing circulation patterns on area roadways; however, a temporary minor increase in traffic may occur during construction activities. The project would not conflict with any applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system. The project is not expected to cause a significant short term or long-term increase in traffic volumes, and thus, would not adversely affect existing levels of service along area roadways. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Refer to response XVI (a). The project would not conflict with any applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system. Impacts would be less than significant.

c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The project would not result in a change to air traffic patterns based on height of the proposed residential structure. Provided this background, the project would not create a safety risk. The project site is not located within any Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) or near any private airstrips. No impacts would result.



Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The project would not alter existing circulation patterns on Via Aprilia in comparison with the existing condition. No design features or incompatible uses are proposed that would increase potential hazards. The project would not affect emergency access to the project site or adjacent properties. Access would be provided to the project site from Via Aprilia. Driveway design for the project is consistent with City design requirements to ensure safe ingress/egress from the properties. Additionally, the project site is located within an existing residential neighborhood and is not an incompatible use that would create hazardous conditions. No impacts would result.

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

Adequate emergency access would be provided during both short-term construction (with construction operating protocols) and long-term operations of the project. Emergency access to the site would be provided from the driveway entrance on Via Aprilia. As such, the project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Impacts would be less than significant.

f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The project would not alter the existing conditions of the project site or adjacent facilities with regard to alternative transportation. Construction of the project would not result in design measures or circulation features that would conflict with existing policies, plan, or programs supporting alternative transportation. No impacts would result.

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

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

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

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

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

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

In accordance with the requirements of Assembly Bill (AB) 52, The City of San Diego sent notification to two Native American Tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area on September 5, 2019. No response was received by either the Lipay Nation of Santa Ysabel or the Jamul Indian Village within the 30-days, therefore, no consultation was requested.

Through the City’s evaluation of the site, it was determined that although there were no previously recorded Cultural Resources identified within the project site, there is a potential for the construction of the project to impact buried and unknown Tribal Cultural Resources due to its location to known recorded resources in the near vicinity. Therefore, Archaeological and Native American monitoring should be included in the MMRP. Mitigation in the form of archaeological and Native American monitoring would reduce all impacts to Tribal Cultural Resources to below a level of significance. See section V of the MND and the Mitigation, Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for further details.

#### XVIII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Implementation of the project would not interrupt existing sewer service to the project site or other surrounding uses. No increase in demand for wastewater disposal or treatment would be created by the project, as compared to current conditions. The project is not anticipated to generate significant amounts of wastewater. Wastewater facilities used by the project would be operated in accordance with the applicable wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). Additionally, the project site is located in an urbanized and developed area. Adequate services are already available to serve the project. No impacts would result.

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

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

Refer to response XVIII (a) above. Adequate services are available to serve the project site. Additionally, the project would not significantly increase the demand for water or wastewater treatment services and thus, would not trigger the need for new treatment facilities. No impacts would result.

- c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

☐
☐
☐
☒

The project would not exceed the capacity of the existing storm water drainage systems and therefore, would not require construction of new or expansion of existing storm water drainage facilities of which could cause significant environmental effects. The project was reviewed by qualified City staff who determined that the existing facilities are adequately sized to accommodate the proposed development. No impacts would result.

- d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

☐
☐
☐
☒

The 2015 City Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) serves as the water resources planning document for the City's residents, businesses, interest groups, and public officials. The UWMP assess the current and future water supply and needs for the City. Implementation of the project would not result in new or expanded water entitlements from the water service provider, as the project is consistent with existing demand projections contained in the UWMP (which are based on the allowed land uses for the project site). The Public Utilities Department local water supply is generated from recycled water, local surface supply, and groundwater, which accounts for approximately 20 percent of the total water requirements for the City. The City purchases water from the San Diego County Water Authority to make up the difference between total water demands and local supplies (City of San Diego 2015). Therefore, the project would not require new or expanded entitlements. No impacts would result.

- e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?

☐
☐
☐
☒

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

- f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate

☐
☐
☒
☐



Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
the project's solid waste disposal needs?				

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

- |  |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulation related to solid waste? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

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

#### XIX. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE –

- |  |                          |                                     |                          |                          |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

As designed, the project would not adversely impact any sensitive plants, plant communities, fish, wildlife or habitat for any sensitive species, as discussed in Section IV, Biological Resources. As such, there is no evidence to support a finding that the project would 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 animals. As documented in this Initial Study, the project may have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, notably with respect to Cultural Resources (Archaeology) and Tribal Cultural Resources. As such, mitigation measures have been incorporated to reduce impacts to less than significant as outlined within the Initial Study.

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable ("cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

As documented in this Initial Study, the project may have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, notably with respect to Cultural Resources (Archaeology) and Tribal Cultural Resources, which may have cumulatively considerable impacts. As such, mitigation measures have been incorporated to reduce impacts to less than significant. Other future projects within the surrounding neighborhood or community would be required to comply with applicable local, State, and Federal regulations to reduce the potential impacts to less than significant, or to the extent possible. As such, the project is not anticipated to contribute potentially significant cumulative environmental impacts.

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

The project is inclusive of a remodel and construction of an addition to a single-family residence. The project is consistent with the environmental setting and with the use as anticipated by the City. It is not anticipated that construction activities would create conditions that would significantly, directly, or indirectly impact human beings. Impacts would be less than significant.

**INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST  
REFERENCES**

**I. Aesthetics / Neighborhood Character**

- ☒ City of San Diego General Plan
- ☒ Community Plans: Torrey Pines

**II. Agricultural Resources & Forest Resources**

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

**III. Air Quality**

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

**IV. Biology**

- ☒ City of San Diego, Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP), Subarea Plan, 1997
- ☒ City of San Diego, MSCP, "Vegetation Communities with Sensitive Species and Vernal Pools" Maps, 1996
- ☒ City of San Diego, MSCP, "Multiple Habitat Planning Area" maps, 1997
- ☐ Community Plan - Resource Element
- ☐ California Department of Fish and Game, California Natural Diversity Database, "State and Federally-listed Endangered, Threatened, and Rare Plants of California," January 2001
- ☐ California Department of Fish and Game, California Natural Diversity Database, "State and Federally-listed Endangered and Threatened Animals of California," January 2001
- ☐ City of San Diego Land Development Code Biology Guidelines
- ☐ Site Specific Report:

**V. Cultural Resources (includes Historical Resources)**

- ☒ City of San Diego Historical Resources Guidelines
- ☒ City of San Diego Archaeology Library
- ☒ Historical Resources Board List
- ☐ Community Historical Survey:
- ☐ Site Specific Report

**VI. Geology/Soils**

- ☒ City of San Diego Seismic Safety Study
- ☒ U.S. Department of Agriculture Soil Survey - San Diego Area, California, Part I and II, December 1973 and Part III, 1975
- ☐ Site Specific Report:

**VII. Greenhouse Gas Emissions**

- ☒ City of San Diego Climate Action Plan (CAP), (City of San Diego 2015)



☒ City of San Diego Climate Action Plan Consistency Checklist – EPB Residence Remodel CDP

**VIII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

☒ San Diego County Hazardous Materials Environmental Assessment Listing  
☒ San Diego County Hazardous Materials Management Division  
☐ FAA Determination  
☒ State Assessment and Mitigation, Unauthorized Release Listing, Public Use Authorized, GeoTracker: <https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/>  
☒ State Assessment and Mitigation, Unauthorized Release Listing, Public Use Authorized  
☐ Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan  
☐ Site Specific Report:

**IX. Hydrology/Drainage**

☐ Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM)  
☒ Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), National Flood Insurance Program-Flood Boundary and Floodway Map  
☐ Clean Water Act Section 303(b) list, [http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/tmdl/303d\\_lists.html](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/tmdl/303d_lists.html)  
☒ Site Specific Report: *Hydrology/Drainage Study for EPB Residence Remodel*, prepared by Snipes-Dye Associates (January 6, 2020)

**X. Land Use and Planning**

☒ City of San Diego General Plan  
☒ Community Plan: Torrey Pines  
☐ Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan  
☒ City of San Diego Zoning Maps  
☐ FAA Determination  
☐ Other Plans:

**XI. Mineral Resources**


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

**XII. Noise**

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

**XIII. Paleontological Resources**

- X   City of San Diego Paleontological Guidelines  
     Deméré, Thomas A., and Stephen L. Walsh, "Paleontological Resources City of San Diego,"  
Department of Paleontology San Diego Natural History Museum, 1996
- X   Kennedy, Michael P., and Gary L. Peterson, "Geology of the San Diego Metropolitan Area,  
California. Del Mar, La Jolla, Point Loma, La Mesa, Poway, and SW 1/4 Escondido 7 1/2  
Minute Quadrangles," *California Division of Mines and Geology Bulletin* 200, Sacramento, 1975  
     Kennedy, Michael P., and Siang S. Tan, "Geology of National City, Imperial Beach and Otay  
Mesa Quadrangles, Southern San Diego Metropolitan Area, California," Map Sheet 29, 1977  
     Site Specific Report:
- XIV. Population / Housing**
- X   City of San Diego General Plan  
  X   Community Plan: Torrey Pines  
     Series 11/Series 12 Population Forecasts, SANDAG  
     Other:
- XV. Public Services**
- X   City of San Diego General Plan  
  X   Community Plan: Torrey Pines
- XVI. Recreational Resources**
- X   City of San Diego General Plan  
  X   Community Plan: Torrey Pines  
     Department of Park and Recreation  
     City of San Diego - San Diego Regional Bicycling Map  
     Additional Resources:
- XVII. Transportation / Circulation**
- X   City of San Diego General Plan  
  X   Community Plan: Torrey Pines  
  X   San Diego Metropolitan Area Average Weekday Traffic Volume Maps, SANDAG  
  X   San Diego Region Weekday Traffic Volumes, SANDAG  
     Site Specific Report:
- XVIII. Utilities**
- X   City of San Diego General Plan  
  X   Community Plan: Torrey Pines  
     Site Specific Report:
- XIX. Water Conservation**
- Sunset Magazine, *New Western Garden Book*, Rev. ed. Menlo Park, CA: Sunset Magazine
- XX. Water Quality**
- X   Clean Water Act Section 303(b) list, [http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/tmdl/303d\\_lists.html](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/tmdl/303d_lists.html)  
     Site Specific Report:



## Location Map

EPB Residence Remodel CDP - Project No. 640358  
2275 Via Aprilia

Figure 1



