

ERRATA

Intensive Care Unit and Emergency Services Pavilion Addendum No. 697308 May 8, 2023

Subsequent to finalization of the Addendum to Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) No. 84791, dated February 16, 2023, revisions to the environmental document have been made. Specifically, the summary of the proposed project has been revised adding clarity to the required SDG&E work and the mitigation section has been revised to include standard mitigation language as well as remove previous mitigation that is no longer applicable. The following revisions to the environmental document have been made and are reflected in a ~~striketrough~~ and/or underline format.

1. Subject, page 1 - The project description has been revised to clarify that the existing helipad is being relocated:

"The CUP amendment would allow for the addition of 14 beds to the existing hospital and the continuation of hospital uses within a commercial zone. An existing helipad would be relocated from the south-east corner of the existing Children's Hospital to the northeast wing of the new building..."

2. Summary of proposed project, Project Background, page 1 - The project background has been revised to clarify the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) approval process:

"SDG&E provides gas and electric utility services to customers throughout the greater San Diego County and South Orange County areas, including to RCHSD, and is regulated by the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC). RCHSD has submitted a request to SDG&E to relocate some of its gas and electric facilities in order to comply with the State of California's mandate to meet seismic safety requirements for all medical facilities by its 2030 deadline. The CPUC would review the project to determine if the proposed utility relocation scope of work necessitates relinquishment or encroachment of existing land rights, - it would be and therefore would be subject to the CPUC Section 851 Advice Letter review/approval process.

3. Section I, Summary of Proposed Project, Project Components, page 3 - Clarification has been added to reflect the existing helipad is being relocated:

"The project includes the relocation of an existing construction and commissioning of a new helipad on to the roof of the ICU/ESP building to retain the required adjacency to the emergency department and the ICUs."

4. Section II, Environmental Setting, page 9 - Clarification was added to the environmental:

"The 27.47-acre project site is located within an existing 127-acre institutional/health care center that includes the existing 387 bed Rady Children's Hospital in the City of San Diego south of the Interstate (I-) 805 and State Route (SR-) 163 freeways interchange (Figure 1). An

existing helipad is located on the south-east corner of the existing Children's Hospital of the project site. The project site is located on the Rady Children's Hospital-San Diego (RCHSD) campus and is generally bounded by Frost Street on the north, Children's Way on the east, Birmingham Way on the south, and the Sharp Memorial Hospital campus to the west (Figure 2).

The project site is zoned CO-1-2 (Commercial Office), has a General Plan land use designation of Institutional and Public and Semi-Public Facilities, and has a Serra Mesa Community Plan land use designation of Institutional."

5. Section III, Summary of Original Project, page 9 - the summary of the original project has been revised to reflect original approval of the helipad:

"Conditional Use Permit (CUP) No. 91-0137 allowed for the construction and operation of a roof-top helipad on the new wing addition of Children's Hospital. The Children's Hospital Helipad Project Negative Declaration No. 91-0137 analyzed the construction of the existing helipad."

6. Section V, Noise, page 27 - Added text summarizing the noise analysis described in Negative Declaration No. 91-0137:

"Negative Declaration No. 91-0137 found that helicopter operations at the proposed Children's Hospital helipad would result in brief periods of increased noise levels during the time of flyovers. However, there would be no increase in ambient noise levels (CNEL) as a result of the proposed helipad and related helicopter operations. Therefore, due to the existing ambient noise levels, the low frequency of helicopter flights and the short duration of the activity, noise impacts from proposed helipad would not be considered significant."

7. Section V, Noise, Project, page 27 - The discussion was revised to reflect the conclusions of the NOISE REPORT:

"The project's operational noise sources would include the CUP. A noise analysis was conducted for the project (Colin Gordon Associates 2022) and the results are incorporated by reference herein. The projects operational noise levels within the project site, noise levels associated with the operation of the project CUP would be within the 65-dB daytime limit for commercial uses (adjacent buildings) and within the 60-dB nighttime limit of the City Noise Ordinance. Project construction noise from demolition, site preparation (e.g., clearing and grubbing), grading/excavation, building construction, and paving would not result in noise levels above the City's noise ordinance construction noise threshold of 75 A-weighted decibel (dBA L_{EQ}; 12-hour).

Long-term on-site operational noise from the Project's operational equipment (heating, ventilation, and air conditioning units, exhaust fans, generators, boilers, chillers, and water pumps) would not exceed the City noise ordinance thresholds at nearby land uses.

8. Section V, Transportation/Circulation, 2007 ACP MND, page 32 - Additional text has been added to clarify previous analysis:

"The ACP Expansion MND analyzed traffic using the LOS metric. The ACP MND found that a significant traffic impact would occur at the intersection of Mesa College Drive and Berger Avenue under existing plus cumulative plus project conditions.."

9. Section V, Transportation/Circulation, Project, page 32 – The text has been revised to clarify the VMT discussion:

A preliminary analysis for the project (Linscott, Law, & Greenspan, Engineers 2021) notes that because staffing counts would be nearly the same as current and no additional parking would be provided, which would limit the number of new trips that would be generated, the number of beds is the best predictor of trip generation for the project. Based on the proposed hospital bed increase, the project would generate 280 average daily traffic (ADT) with 25 AM peak-hour trips and 28 PM peak-hour trips.

~~Based on the City of San Diego Transportation Study Manual (TSM) guidance, a Local Mobility Analysis (LMA) is not necessary for projects that generate under 500 ADT. Therefore, the project is exempted from having to prepare an LMA, and impacts would be less than significant.~~

Per the City of San Diego Transportation Study Manual (TSM) guidance screening criteria, since because the project would generate 280 ADT it would be considered a Small Project (a project generating less than 300 trips), ~~that is, exempted-screened out~~ from having to prepare a detailed vehicle miles travelled (VMT) analysis. Impacts are presumed to ~~would~~ be less than significant.

10. Mitigation V, Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Program (MMRP), page 37 – Standard Mitigation language added to the MMRP:

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 Biologist, Qualified Paleontological 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) #697308 and /or Environmental Document # 697308, 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.

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:

DOCUMENT SUBMITTAL/INSPECTION CHECKLIST		
Issue Area	Document Submittal	Associated Inspection/Approvals/Notes
<u>General</u>	<u>Consultant Qualification Letters</u>	<u>Prior to Preconstruction Meeting</u>
<u>General</u>	<u>Consultant Construction Monitoring Exhibits</u>	<u>Prior to or at Preconstruction Meeting</u>
<u>Biology</u>	<u>Biologist Limit of Work Verification</u>	<u>Limit of Work Inspection</u>
<u>Land Use</u>	<u>Land Use Adjacency Issues CVSRs</u>	<u>Land Use Adjacency Issue Site Observations</u>
<u>Paleontology</u>	<u>Paleontology Reports</u>	<u>Paleontology Site Observation</u>
<u>Bond Release</u>	<u>Request for Bond Release Letter</u>	<u>Final MMRP Inspections Prior to Bond Release Letter</u>

11. Mitigation V, Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Program (MMRP), Raptor Mitigation, Pg. 39 – The original Raptor Mitigation measure for MND No. 84791 was inadvertently included;

however, per the project specific biology memorandum report no sensitive raptor species occur on site and therefore the mitigation measure has been removed as a requirement:

Raptor Mitigation

- ~~1. Prior to the issuance of grading permits, a qualified biologist shall determine the presence or absence of occupied raptor nests within the project site, with written results submitted to the Assistant Deputy Director (ADD) of Land Development Review Division (LDR).~~
 - ~~— If active raptor nests are identified during the pre-grading survey and project construction has the potential to impact raptors during the raptor breeding season (February 1 – September 15) within or adjacent to the MHPA, an appropriate avoidance area must be identified and flagged. This restriction shall be noted on all grading and construction plans. If raptor nests are located within the distances listed above, weekly biological monitoring of these nests shall be conducted by the project biologist during the breeding season (February 1 through September 15) with written results submitted to the ADD of LDR. If no raptor nests are discovered in the trees to be removed, no further mitigation is required as long as the trees are not within the avoidance buffer area of any identified raptor nests.~~
- ~~2. During Construction~~
 - ~~a. If raptor nests are discovered during construction activities, the biologist shall notify the Resident Engineer (RE).~~
 - ~~b. The RE shall stop work in the vicinity of the nests. The qualified biologist shall mark all pertinent trees and delineate the appropriate "no construction" buffer area or as noted in Biological Resources – Raptors measure I.B. (above), around any nest sites, satisfactory to the ADD of LDR. The buffer shall be maintained until the qualified biologist determines, and determines and demonstrates in a survey report satisfactory to the ADD of LDR that any young birds have fledged.~~
- ~~3. Post Construction~~
 - ~~a. The biologist shall be responsible for ensuring that all field notes and reports have been completed, all outstanding items of concern have been resolved or noted for follow up, and that focused surveys are completed, as appropriate.~~
 - ~~b. Within three months following the completion of monitoring, two copies of the Final Biological Monitoring Report (even if negative) and/or evaluation report, if applicable, which describes the results, analysis, and conclusions of the Biological Monitoring Program (with appropriate graphics) shall be submitted to Mitigation Monitoring Coordination (MMC) for approval by the ADD of LDR.~~
 - ~~c. For any unforeseen additional biological resources impacted during monitoring, the rehabilitation, revegetation, or other such follow up action planes) shall be included as part of Final Biological Monitoring Report.~~

12. Section VIII, Certification, page 45 – The text has been updated to reflect current language:

Copies of the addendum, the adopted MND, the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, and associated project-specific technical appendices, if any, may be reviewed in the office of the Development Services Department, or purchased for the cost of reproduction.

Copies of the addendum, the adopted MND(s), the MMRP, and associated project-specific technical appendices, if any, may be accessed on the City's CEQA webpage at <https://www.sandiego.gov/ceqa/final>.

The revisions made to the Addendum do not affect the environmental analysis or conclusions of the environmental document. The addition of new information clarifies, amplifies, or makes insignificant modifications and do not result in no new impacts or new mitigation.