# ADDENDUM



THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO

Project No. 605191 Addendum to EIR No. 30330/304032 SCH No. 2004651076

SUBJECT: CAL TERRACES – PLANNING AREA (PA) 61: A request for a COMMUNITY PLAN AMENDMENT (CPA) to redesignate a 9.20-acre portion of the project site from Community Commercial - Residential Prohibited to Community Commercial -Residential Permitted and to downgrade the segment of Caliente Avenue between Otay Mesa Road and State Route 905 (SR-905) westbound On-Ramp from 6-Lane Primary Arterial to 5-Lane Primary Arterial (3 lanes southbound and 2 lanes northbound), to REZONE a portion of the site from CC-1-3 to RM-3-7, a PUBLIC EASEMENT VACATION, a PUBLIC RIGHT-OF-WAY VACATION, a VESTING TENTATIVE MAP (VTM), a SITE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT (SDP), MASTER PLANNED DEVELOPMENT PERMIT, and a NEIGHBORHOOD DEVELOPMENT PERMIT (NDP)to subdivide one parcel into two lots and allow development. Lot 1, approximately 4.50 acres, would allow for the construction of 45,000 square feet (sf) of commercial; whereas Lot 2, approximately 9.20 acres, would allow for the development of up to 267 multi-family dwelling units with a passive recreation park. The VTM currently proposes 171 multi-family dwelling units and 45,000 square feet of commercial uses; however, for purposes of the environmental analysis, the maximum development potential of 267 multi-family dwelling units and 45,000 sf of commercial use is analyzed. The project would also construct various on-site improvements consisting of utility infrastructure (water, sewer, storm drains, gas/electric, and communications lines), landscaping, and internal roadways. The Public Easement Vacation would vacate a portion of the existing public service easement located adjacent to Otay Mesa Road, between proposed Public Street A and Public Street B. The Public Right-of-Way Vacation would vacate a portion of Otay Mesa Road along a 470-foot-long portion of the project frontage. The project would request allowable deviations from applicable development regulations with respect to front-yard setbacks, side-yard setbacks, and street-side setbacks. The project would conform to the Affordable/In-Fill Housing and Sustainable Buildings Expedite Program by providing at least 10 percent of the total units on-site as affordable units (18 affordable units are currently proposed for the 171 dwelling unit project; however, should the maximum 267 units be developed, at least 27 affordable housing units would be provided to meet the 10 percent requirement). The overall vacant 14.6-acre project site is located at the southeast corner of Caliente Avenue and Otay Mesa Road, consisting of one parcel (Assessor's Parcel Number [APN] 645-080-16-00). The site has a land use designation of Community Commercial - Residential and is zoned CC-1-3 within the Otay Mesa Community Plan area. Additionally, the project site is within the Community Plan

Implementation Overlay Zone – Type A, 2035 Transit Priority Area, Airport Influence Area (Review Area 2- Brown Field), and the Federal Aviation Administration Part 77 Notification Area (Brown Field). (LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Parcel 1: All that portion of the northwest guarter of the northwest guarter of Section 32, Township 18 South, Range 1 West, San Bernardino Base and Meridian in the City of San Diego, County of San Diego, California according to the official plat thereof, described as follows: Beginning at the northwest corner of said Section 32, thence along the westerly line of said Section 32, south 00°18'24" west 348.92 feet; thence south 61°46'14" east 309.64 feet; thence south 72°16'59" east 1107.21 feet to an intersection with the easterly line of said northwest quarter of the northwest quarter of said Section 32; thence along said easterly line north 00°26'17" east 804.78 feet to an intersection with the northerly line of said Section 32; thence along said northerly line north 88°48'52" west 1332.08 feet to the point of beginning; Parcel 2: That portion of the west one-half of the northwest quarter of Section 32, Township 18 south, Range 1 west, San Bernardino Meridian, in the city of San Diego, county of San Diego, state of California, according to the official plat thereof, more particularly described as "Parcel 2" guitclaim deed to Rancho Villa Apartments No. 2 LLC, Recorded on June 24, 2002 as DOC #2002-0530243 in the office of the County Recorder of said County.)

Applicant: Pardee Homes.

## I. SUMMARY OF ORIGINAL PROJECT

#### California Terraces Precise Plan and VTM – Environmental Impact Report

The Planning Area (PA) 61 project site was part of the California Terraces project that approved through a Community Plan Amendment, a Master Rezone, the California Terraces Precise Plan, Vesting Tentative Maps (VTMs) for California Terraces (VTM No. 86-1032) and South Palm Vista (VTM No. 90-0574), a Hillside Review Permit, Resources Protection Ordinance Permit, a Planned Development Permit, a Small Lot Overlay Zone, and a Community Plan Implementation Overlay Zone (CPIOZ) A (which has been superseded by the Otay Mesa CPIOZ described below). The Precise Plan included development of approximately 664.8 acres in the western portion of Otay Mesa with 5,375 residential dwelling units, 22.4 acres of commercial uses, 153.4 acres of open space, four school sites comprised of 53.6 acres, 26.2 acres for parks, and other associated public utilities. The Precise Plan identified the project site as PA 61 and designated and zoned the site as Commercial. The California Terraces Precise Plan identifies the site for commercial use that would provide for goods and services to the community's residential areas to the north and employment areas to the east. The Precise Plan further envisions development of either a retail commercial center or commercial offices to include financial services. An Environmental Impact Report (EIR) (No. 86-1032/SCH No. 85022015) was prepared to evaluate the overall impacts of the California Terraces Precise Plan project area. The EIR was certified by the San Diego City Council on April 12, 1994 via Resolution No. R-283692. VTM No. 86-1032 showed grading of the entire PA 61 project area and a grading permit was issued for the site pursuant to the approved VTM. Nearly all of California Terraces (now called Ocean View Hills) has been developed and SR-905 was completed south of the project site. The approved California Terraces Precise Plan in shown in Figure 6.

## **Otay Mesa Community Plan Update**

Subsequent to the approval of the Precise Plan, the Otay Mesa Community Plan underwent an update. The overall impacts of the community plan update (CPU) were evaluated in a Program EIR (No. 30330/304032; SCH No. 2004651076) that was certified by the San Diego City Council on March 11, 2014, via Resolution No. R-308810 (hereinafter referred to as the 2013 Program EIR). The Otay Mesa CPU involved an update to the Otay Mesa Community Plan, a General Plan Amendment, rescission of the Otay Mesa Development District (OMDD), adoption of a Rezone Ordinance to replace the OMDD with citywide zoning and creation of two new CPIOZs, amendments to the City's Land Development Code (LDC), and an update of the Otay Mesa Community Plan Public Facilities Financing Plan (PFFP).

The Otay Mesa CPU provides a long-range, comprehensive policy framework for growth and development in the Otay Mesa community through 2062. The CPU identified a land use strategy with new land use designation proposals to create villages, activity centers, and industrial/employment centers along major transportation corridors, while strengthening cultural and business linkages to Tijuana, Mexico via the Otay Mesa Port of Entry. The land use element established a number of land use planning goals for the CPU area, such as providing a distribution of land uses that provides sufficient capacity for a variety of uses, facilities, and services needed to serve Otay Mesa, providing distinct villages that include places to live, work, and recreate, providing diversified commercial uses that serve local, community, and regional needs, and providing sufficient industrial land capacity to maintain Otay Mesa as a subregional employment center, among others.

Additionally, the Otay Mesa CPU built on the previous community plan in terms of land uses as the CPU incorporated the existing land uses and densities for developed or approved neighborhood. such as Ocean View Hills, Robinhood Ridge, California Terraces, Dennery Ranch, and Hidden Trails, as these areas were expected to remain relatively stable during the planning horizon. In addition, the CPU incorporated precise plans that have been adopted throughout the planning area to help implement community plan goals, as seen in Figure 1-3 of the CPU. Precise Plans with a residential focus include the California Terraces, Dennery Ranch, Hidden Trails, Riviera del Sol, Robinhood Ridge, and Santee Investments Precise Plans.

The CPU included the same nine elements contained in the City's 2008 General Plan, with goals and policies for each element. The nine elements are: Land Use; Mobility; Urban Design; Economic Prosperity; Public Facilities, Services, and Safety; Recreation; Conservation; Noise; and Historic Preservation.

Implementation of the CPU requires subsequent approval of public and private development proposals to carry out the land use plan and demonstrate compliance with policies presented in the CPU. The process for accomplishing environmental review for individual future development projects includes the submittal of additional information in accordance with the supplemental regulations of the CPIOZ A to determine if biological, archaeological, or paleontological resources are present on a project site, or if a specific use exceeds the traffic generation threshold.

The 2013 Program EIR concluded that the project would result in significant and unmitigated environmental impacts to air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, noise, traffic/circulation, and

utilities. The following issue areas were determined to be significant but mitigated to below a level of significance with mitigation: land use, biological resources, historical resources, hydrology/water quality, geology. and paleontological resources. All other impacts analyzed in the Draft EIR were determined to be less than significant.

As it pertains to the project site, the Otay Mesa CPU currently designates the site as Community Commercial-Residential Prohibited and is zoned CC-1-3 (Commercial-Community).

# II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project's regional location and location on USGS map is shown on Figures 1 and 2. The project's location on an aerial photo is shown on Figure 3. The Site Plan is shown on Figure 4 while the VTM is shown on Figure 5. The project includes a request for a COMMUNITY PLAN AMENDMENT (CPA) to redesignate a 9.20-acre portion of the project site from Community Commercial – Residential Prohibited to Residential Medium density which would permit multi-family residential development at a density range of 15 to 29 dwelling units per acre. The CPA would also include a downgrade to the segment of Caliente Avenue between Otay Mesa Road and SR-905 WB On-Ramp from a 6-Lane Primary Arterial to a 5-Lane Primary Arterial (3 lanes southbound and 2 lanes northbound). A REZONE is proposed within a portion of the site from CC-1-3 to RM-3-7 which would implement the proposed residential land use. A VESTING TENTATIVE MAP (VTM) is requested to subdivide the property into two lots. A SITE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT (SDP) is required to allow for development in environmentally sensitive lands (ESLs). A MASTER PLANNED DEVELOPMENT PERMIT (MPDP) is requested to establish design guidelines and development regulations for the project site. A NEIGHBORHOOD DEVELOPMENT PERMIT (NDP) is requested to allow for deviations from applicable development regulations, per Section 143.0920(a). A STREET VACATION is proposed to vacate a portion of Otay Mesa Road that was shown on the original VTM pursuant to the Precise Plan.

While a Site Plan and VTM are currently in process that identifies 45,000 square feet of commercial space and 171 multi-family residential dwelling units, as shown in Table 1, this development scenario is provided for information only and the addendum analysis is based on the maximum development potential of 267 dwelling units. Lot 1 would be reserved for the future commercial development with up to 45,000 square feet located at the southeast corner of Otay Mesa Road and Caliente Avenue. Lot 2, located just east of Lot 1 and south of Otay Mesa Road, would allow development of up to 267 multi-family residential condominium units (with at least 10 percent affordable units) with a private passive recreational park.

Table 1 Site Development Summary							
Land Use Zoning Acres Minimum Allowed <sup>1</sup> Maximum Allowed Current Allowed <sup>1</sup> Maximum Allowed Site Plan in Addendum) <sup>1</sup> Proposa							
Commercial	CC-1-3	4.49	NA	45,000 sf	45,000 sf		
Multi-Family Residential	RM-2-5	9.20	138 du	267 du	171 du		
Streets (public right-of-way)	(public right-of-way) NA 0.91 NA NA NA						
Total 14.60							

du = dwelling unit; sf = square feet; NA = not applicable.

<sup>1</sup>This addendum evaluates the maximum allowed development per the Master Planned Development Permit (MPDP) for California Terraces – PA 61 (Placeworks 2019. The permit process that would permit the maximum development allowed is described in Chapter 4 of the MPDP.

<sup>2</sup> The currently proposed VTM identifies a total of 171 multi-family du and 45,000 sf of commercial uses.

Design guidelines for both the commercial and residential components have been prepared to ensure that project elements are implemented in a coordinated manner and to provide consistency with previously approved plans including the California Terraces Precise Plan and Otay Mesa Community Plan. In addition to providing a comprehensive vision for the development of the project, the design guidelines also provide site amenities and architectural details relating to buildings, roadways and sidewalks, lighting, landscaping, and walls and fencing (see Chapter 3.0 of the Design Guidelines of the MPDP (Placeworks 2019).

# **Requested Deviations**

The project site is located within a 2035 Transit Priority Area (TPA) and is considered an "in-fill project" per San Diego Municipal Code (SDMC) Section 143.0915(b) and is, therefore, eligible to request allowable deviations from applicable development regulations pursuant to an NDP per LDC Regulations provided that findings in Section 126.0404(a)(1) and 126.0404(f)(2) are made. The project is requesting the following deviations as summarized in Table 2.

Table 2 Requested Deviations					
Municipal Code Regulation	SDMC Language	Required	Proposed Deviation		
Section 131.0443,	Minimum Front Setback	15 Feet	Minimum 10 Feet		
Table 131-04G	Standard Front Setback	20 Feet	Willing the rect		
Section 131.0443,	Minimum Sidovard Sotback	5 Feet or 10% of	Minimum 10 Foot		
Table 131-04G	Minimum Sideyard Setback	Premises Width	Minimum To Feet		
Section 131.0443,	Minimum Street Side	10 Feet or 10% of	Minimum 10 Foot		
Table 131-04G	Setback	Minimum TO Feet			

#### Parking, Site Access, and Pedestrian Improvements

Vehicular access to the project site would be located along Otay Mesa Road via two internal streets designated as Street A and Street B on the site plan. Internal roadways would be reconfigured from the previously approved Final Map associated with California Terraces to allow for vehicular access to the residential units as well as future commercial space. The residential component of the project

is required to provide a minimum of 342 automobile parking spaces (including 9 accessible spaces), and 18 motorcycle spaces, consistent with the SDMC Section 142-05C. The project proposes 342 garage spaces, 10 accessible spaces, 20 motorcycle spaces, and 59 open parking spaces (including seven electric vehicle [EV] and six EV capable).

Two new public cul-de-sac streets are proposed as part of the project (Street A and Street B). Project access would be from driveways on these cul-de-sac streets. The intersection of Caliente Avenue/Emerald Crest Court would be signalized by the first applicant to obtain building permits between this project and the adjacent Handler commercial project, unless it is completed beforehand as outlined in the Deferred Improvement Agreement between Garden Communities and City of San Diego, dated April 24, 2007. The Handler commercial project is located directly to the east of the project site, consisting of a hotel and five restaurants within a 21.3-acre site. The Greenfield Village Apartments project by Garden Communities is built and located directly across Otay Mesa Road north of the project site. The applicant would construct a 6-foot non-contiguous sidewalk along the project frontage on Otay Mesa Road, replacement of the sidewalk along Caliente Avenue with a 6-foot non-contiguous sidewalk along the project frontage, and throughout Street A and Street B. Several connections are provided between the sidewalk and the residential area, while the future commercial area would also incorporate connections between the commercial site and the sidewalk. The residential side would have sidewalks and crosswalks for pedestrians to reach the on-site park and commercial site. The project would connect with an existing sidewalk on the east side of Caliente Avenue that extends in a southerly direction across State Route 905 (SR-905).

The project includes the removal of the existing K-Rail with fence in the median along the project's frontage on Otay Mesa Road and replacement with a full width concrete raised median.

## Landscaping

The landscape plan would provide for a landscaping theme that consists of a natural, droughttolerant character that compliments the architecture of the development. Canopy trees would be used to soften architectural edges. The plant palette includes shade trees such as Jacaranda, Chinese Flame Tree, Crape Myrtle, Medjool Date Palm, Olive "Fruitless," and Italian Stone Pine; screening shrubs such as Dwarf Abelia, Mock Orange, and Heavenly Bamboo, to name a few. See project landscape plans for complete details. The location and design of walkways and recreation areas would provide accessible paths of travel to site amenities. In addition, a substantial number of trees are proposed throughout the site to provide shade over parking, recreation areas, and paseos. All planting areas would be mulched to a minimum depth of 3 inches. An irrigation system would be installed within the project site, and all landscaping maintenance would be maintained by the owner of the property. The Maximum Applied Water Allowance (MAWA) for the project is calculated to be 1,249,000 gallons/year. The project would include the installation of a 6-foot-high tubular steel fence along the eastern, western, and southern project boundaries of the residential portion of the project site. The fence would be screened with screening shrubs that would be at least 30 inches in height, as well as with shade trees ranging from 20 to 60 feet.

All landscape and irrigation within the project site would conform to the requirements of the City of San Diego (City) LDC Landscape Standards and the applicable sections of the SDMC Chapter 14, Article 2, Division 4: Landscape Regulations.

## Utilities, Lighting, and Drainage

The project would require the construction of private underground utility lines, including gas, electric, sewer, storm drain, water, fire, telephone, and cable television lines in order to serve the new development. On-site water mains would connect to 12-inch public water lines within Street B and connect to the existing 24-inch water main along Otay Mesa Road and the 16-inch water main along Caliente Avenue. The project would construct on-site 8-inch and 10-inch sewer lines which would transport wastewater from the project to the existing 10-inch portion of the Ocean View Hills Parkway and Caliente Avenue gravity sewer line.

The project would construct outdoor lighting fixtures which would comply with the requirements of SDMC Section 101-1300 under the "Initial Total Lamp Source" Lumens of less than 4,050 exemption.

Storm drain facilities would be constructed within the project site, which would direct runoff from roofs and adjacent hardscape areas onto surrounding landscaping areas for dispersion, where feasible. The project runoff would be conveyed by the private drives to on-site storm drain systems. The majority of the runoff would be conveyed towards the northeast corner of the site where the proposed on-site storm drain would connect to an existing storm drain in Otay Mesa Road about 500 feet east of the site. Storm runoff from the northwest corner of the condominium project would be conveyed by the proposed streets and storm drain system to an existing storm drain system at the intersection of Caliente Avenue and Otay Mesa Road. The runoff would be treated by utilizing structural Best Management Practices (BMPs), which would include the installation of a Modular Wetland System (MWS) Linear BMPS, which would be used to meet flow control requirements.

#### **Grading and Retaining Walls**

Approximately 13.71 acres of the 14.60-acre site would be graded in preparation for construction (see Figure 5). This would require approximately 15,100 cubic yards of cut and 43,800 cubic yards of fill, resulting in a net import of 28,700 cubic yards of soil. The maximum height of cut slopes would be 6 feet at a maximum 2:1 slope ratio. The maximum height of fill slopes would be 6 feet at a maximum 2:1 slope ratio. As detailed in Section 3.6 of the project's Design Guidelines, a retaining wall is planned at the southeast corner of the site, which would vary in height from 2 to 7 feet. The inside portion of the wall would be landscaped. Additionally, a perimeter fence is proposed along the westerly, southerly, and easterly property lines to provide screening from adjacent land uses.

## III. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The overall undeveloped 14.60-acre project site is located at the southeast corner of Caliente Avenue and Otay Mesa Road. The project site is surrounded by SR-905 to the south, Otay Mesa Road and commercial and multi-family residential to the north, Caliente Avenue to the west, and undeveloped, private land to the east (see Figure 3). The site is highly disturbed from past agricultural use as well as previous grading in conjunction with the grading permit issued for VTM No. 86-1032. The project site is entirely fenced with chain link and is relatively flat with earthen berms around the eastern and southern perimeters. Site elevations range from 530 feet above mean sea level (AMSL) near the southwest corner to 518 feet AMSL in the northeast corner of the site. The main source of traffic noise at the project site is vehicle traffic on SR-905, Otay Mesa Road, Caliente Avenue, and SR-905 on- and off-ramps. There are no view corridors or gateway areas adjacent to or near the project site, and while public views along roadways exist throughout the CPU area, the public roadways adjacent to the project site have not been designated as such.

The site is designated Community Commercial – Residential Prohibited (within the Otay Mesa Community Plan area and the previously approved California Terraces Precise Plan area. The project site is zoned CC-1-3 (Community Commercial). Additionally, the site is within the Community Plan Implementation Overlay Zone (CPIOZ A), 2035 Transit Priority Area, Airport Influence Area (Review Area 2-Brown Field), Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Part 77 Notification Area (Brown Field). The site is in a developed urban area currently served by existing public services and utilities.

# IV. ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

The City previously prepared and certified the Otay Mesa Community Plan Update (CPU) Program Environmental Impact Report (2013 Program EIR) (No. 30330/304032/SCH No. 2004651076), per Resolution No. R-308810on March 11, 2014. Based on all available information, the analysis in this EIR Addendum, and in light of the entire record, the City has determined pursuant to Section 15162 and 15164 of the State CEQA Guidelines that:

- There are no substantial changes proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous environmental document due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;
- Substantial changes have not occurred with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous environmental document due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or
- There is no new information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous environmental document was certified as complete or was adopted, that shows any of the following:
  - a. The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous environmental document;
  - b. Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous environmental document;
  - c. Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or
  - d. Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous environmental document would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

Based upon a review of the current project, none of the conditions described in Sections 15162 and 15164 of the State CEQA Guidelines apply. No changes in circumstances have occurred, and no new information of substantial importance has manifested which would result in new significant or substantially increased adverse impacts as a result of the project. Therefore, this Addendum has been prepared in accordance with Section 15164 of the CEQA State Guidelines. The 2013 Program EIR, as well as the 1984 Precise Plan EIR, has is incorporated by reference pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15150. Public review of this Addendum is not required per CEQA.

# V. IMPACT ANALYSIS

The following includes the environmental issues analyzed in detail in the previously certified Program EIR as well as the project–specific environmental analysis pursuant to the CEQA. The analysis in this document evaluates the adequacy of the 2013 Program EIR relative to the project and documents that the proposed modifications and/or refinements would not cause new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the previously certified environmental document.

The 2013 Program EIR identified significant unmitigated impacts relative to Transportation/ Circulation, Air Quality, and Noise.

The 2013 Program EIR identified significant but mitigated impacts to Land Use, Transportation/ Circulation, Air Quality, Noise, Biological Resources, Hydrology/Water Quality, Historical Resources, Paleontological Resources, and Geology.

An overview of the Cal Terraces – PA 61 project impacts in relation to the previously certified 2013 Program EIR is provided in Table 3, Impact Assessment Summary.

Table 3					
2013					
Environmental Issues	Program EIR Finding	Project	New Mitigation?	Project Resultant Impact	
Land Use	Significant but mitigated	No new impacts	No	Less than Significant	
Visual Effects and Neighborhood Character	Less than significant	No new impacts	No	Less than Significant	
Air Quality/Odor	Significant, unmitigated	No new impacts	No	Less than Significant	
<b>Biological Resources</b>	Significant but mitigated	No new impacts	No	Less than Significant	
Historical Resources	Significant, but mitigated	No new impacts	No	Less than significant	
Human Health/Public Safety/Hazardous Materials	Significant, but mitigated	No new impacts	No	Less than Significant	
Hydrology/Water Quality	Significant but mitigated	No new impacts	No	Less than Significant	
Geology/Soils	Significant but mitigated	No new impacts	No	Less than significant	
Energy Conservation	Less than significant	No new impacts	No	Less than significant	
Noise	Significant, unmitigated	No new impacts	No	Less than Significant	
Paleontological Resources	Significant but mitigated	No new impacts	No	Significant but Mitigated	
Traffic/Circulation	Significant, unmitigated	No new impacts	Yes <sup>1</sup>	Less than Significant/ Significant and Unavoidable	
Public Services	Less than significant	No new impacts	No	Less than Significant	
Utilities	Significant, unmitigated	No new impacts	No	Less than significant	
Water Supply	Less than significant	No new impacts	No	Less than significant	
Population and Housing	Less than significant	No new impacts	No	Less than significant	
Agricultural and Mineral Resources	Less than significant	No new impacts	No	Less than significant	
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Significant, unmitigated	No new impacts	No	Less than significant	
<sup>1</sup> The traffic mitigation is consistent with the 2013 Program EIR Mitigation Framework.					

# Land Use

# 2013 Program EIR

Land Use is discussed in Section 5.1 of the 2013 Program EIR that concluded that implementation of the Otay Mesa CPU would not result in impacts related to conflicts with applicable local and regional land use plans. Therefore, impacts were identified to be less than significant.

The 2013 Program EIR identified that residential and industrial uses collocated in proximity to one another could result in incompatible land use impacts. The 2013 Program EIR further identified that future development projects would be required to comply with the collocation policies of the General Plan and CPU to reduce or avoid potential land use incompatibility impacts. The 2013 Program EIR determined that compliance with the CPU and General Plan policies, along with local, state, and federal regulations, would reduce potential impacts of collocation to below a level of significance. The CPU would require the conversion of industrial and agricultural lands to residential and other mixed uses. The environmental effects that would result include the increased potential for exposure of sensitive receptors to hazardous materials. Through implementation of the measures identified in Section 5.6, the potential environmental impacts resulting from change in land use designations in accordance with the CPU were determined to be less than significant.

The 2013 Program EIR identified that the development footprint of the CPU would encroach into sensitive environmentally sensitive land (ESL) areas. Additionally, implementation of the project would have the potential to result in significant impacts to historical resources given the presence of historical resources throughout the CPU area. However, future projects would require subsequent environmental review and compliance with CPU policies, development standards, as well as adherence to the ESL Regulations, Historical Resources Regulations, and site-specific mitigation, as applicable, in accordance with the mitigation framework. Therefore, program-level impacts were concluded to be mitigated to below a level of significance.

Potentially significant impacts of future development on land designated as Multi-Habitat Plan Area (MHPA) by the City's Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) Subarea Plan were identified in the 2013 Program EIR. The impacts identified were associated with indirect impacts wherever development and human activity would interface with MHPA lands. The 2013 Program EIR concluded that impacts could be significant, but through compliance with established standards and regulations and as well as the mitigation framework would serve to reduce impacts to below a level of significance to MHPA Lands.

# Project

The PA 61 project proposes a Community Plan Amendment from Community Commercial -Residential Prohibited to Community Commercial – Residential Permitted, and associated REZONE from CC-1-3 to RM-3-7, to allow residential uses within a portion of the site. Notwithstanding the changes to the existing community plan and California Terraces Precise Plan, the project would be consistent with the CPU and Precise Plan and would be aligned with the following City Strategic Plan goals and objectives: Goal 2 (Work in partnership with all communities to achieve safe and livable neighborhoods) and Goal 3 (Create and sustain a resilient and economically prosperous City). The project would be consistent with specific CPU policies pertaining to housing (Policy 2.2-2: Integrate a variety of housing types within village and residentially designated areas with multi-modal access from the villages to the employment centers in the eastern portion of Otay Mesa; Policy 2.2-6: Promote affordable housing development through the provision of a variety of housing types, including flats, townhomes, smaller-lot single-family homes, and other types of housing that are affordable in nature), as well as policies pertaining to commercial development (Policy 2.3-1: Maintain lands for existing commercial development within Otay Mesa to serve the demands of the residential and employment communities), as it would increase housing supply and provide affordable housing units, while maintaining commercial development. In regard to the Otay Mesa CPIOZ regulations, the project site is located within the CPIOZ A per the land use plan for the CPU.

However, the project site is not subject to these regulations, as this analysis has been superseded by the prior grading permit issued for the California Terraces VTM and, therefore, would not conflict with the CPIOZ regulations. Impacts would be less than significant.

Based upon a review of the City's strategic housing and community planning goals, as well and the General Plan Land Use Element (specifically Policy LU-D.13), the site would best serve the Ocean View Hills community and support the land use plan as residential and commercial use rather than commercial only. The project would focus growth into a mixed-use activity center that would be pedestrian-friendly and within proximity to the public transportation system. The City of Villages strategy encourages future development to increase housing supply and diversity with compact, mixed-use activity centers that are integrated into the larger community. As a residential and commercial development, the project would increase the housing supply within the CPU area, in proximity to a new commercial center, and would thus work to achieve the City of Villages strategy. Therefore, with the proposed amendment to the Community Plan, the project would not conflict with or be incompatible with the adjacent land uses and relevant land use plans. Impacts would be less than significant.

The project would not place residential development in proximity to industrial uses; therefore, no impacts associated with collocation issues would result. Although the project would place residential units within close proximity to a freeway, thereby potentially subjecting the occupants to noise levels or air quality emissions impacts above the applicable City thresholds; therefore, the project would include design measures intended to reduce potential exposure to noise or air quality emissions. See the Air Quality and Noise discussions below for a complete analysis on air quality and noise impacts. In addition, the project is designated and zoned for commercial uses; therefore, the project would uses, result in conversion of industrial and agricultural lands to residential and other mixed uses, resulting in no impact.

The project site is located outside of and not adjacent to MHPA. However, the project does contain burrowing owl habitat which would be considered an ESL. A Western Burrowing Owl Non-Breeding Survey (Burrowing Owl Survey) was completed for the project by RECON Environmental, Inc. (RECON 2018a). As detailed therein, the project site does contain habitat that is suitable for burrowing owl burrows, and a burrow complex comprised of seven burrows was observed within the eastern portion of the site; however, no western burrowing owls were detected within the project site during the nonbreeding season surveys. Although no burrowing owls were detected, there is a moderate potential for this species to occur within the western portion of the project site, as the habitat is less dense and suitable burrows are present. Consistent with the 2013 Program EIR, the project would include mitigation measures as anticipated under the mitigation framework. The project would include mitigation measure BIO-1 (see Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan, below). Compliance with the 2013 Program EIR mitigation framework related to burrowing owls would ensure that the project would not conflict with ESL regulations as it pertains to biological resources.

Significant archaeological sites were identified in the 1994 California Terraces EIR within the development area for the California Terraces Precise Plan; however, all archaeological sites were either placed in open space, tested and found not to be significant, or were mitigated through completion of data recovery. Although all identified archaeological sites within the California Terraces Precise Plan area have been fully mitigated, the project site is located within an area that is known to support potentially significant cultural resources. Therefore, the project would be required

to implement the mitigation framework identified in the 2013 Program EIR. Specifically, if additional grading is required into previously undisturbed soils, the project would be required to implement measure HIST-1 (cultural resources monitoring during grading) as detailed in the 2013 Program EIR. Implementation of this mitigation measure would ensure that the project would be consistent with the Historical Resources Regulations (Section 143.0210 of the Land Development Code). In addition, the project site is vacant with no structures that would qualify as a historical resource. Therefore, measure HIST-2 would not be applicable to the project.

Based on the foregoing analysis and information, there is no evidence that the project would require a major change to the 2013 Program EIR. The project would not result in a new significant impact, nor would a substantial increase in the severity of impacts from that described in the 2013 Program EIR occur.

#### **Visual Effects and Neighborhood Character**

#### 2013 Program EIR

Section 5.2 of the 2013 Program EIR provides an analysis of visual effects and neighborhood character impacts associated with the Otay Mesa Community Plan Update. Potential impacts could result to: public views; alteration of the communities' visual character by introducing development that is incompatible with the scale and design of surrounding development; the alteration of the existing landform through grading; and through a negative visual appearance due to the loss, covering, or modification of any unique physical features such as a natural canyon or hillside slope in excess of 25 percent gradient.

The 2013 Program EIR concluded that implementation of the CPU would not result in significant impacts to the existing or planned character of the area. The majority of the existing public views of canyons and mesas would be preserved under the CPU and to prevent impacts to views of public resources, the CPU included designating view corridors and gateways through plan policies and project design features. With compliance with the CPU policies as well as inclusion of these project design features, impacts to public views would be less than significant.

The 2013 Program EIR determined that impacts associated with compatibility with surrounding neighborhood character would be less than significant, as future development would be required to comply with the relevant land use and development design guidelines and policies of the General Plan and CPU. The 2013 Program EIR determined that vacant, graded areas within the Northwest District are not considered visually sensitive and future development would improve visual compatibility with existing development. Through implementation of the plan update, the visual character of the CPU area would become more urbanized. The land use and development design guidelines and policies of the CPU are intended to ensure that future development within the CPU area would not result in architecture, urban design, landscaping, or landforms that would negatively affect the visual quality of the area, or strongly contrast with the surrounding development or natural topography through excessive bulk, signage, or architectural projection. Future development would be required to comply with the relevant land use and development design guidelines and policies of the General Plan and CPU. In addition, development in areas designated for commercial and industrial uses on properties that have been previously graded and developed with structures that conform to the Urban Design Element would be subject to review in accordance with CPIOZ A. Development proposals that do not comply with the CPIOZ A supplemental regulations would be

subject to discretionary review in accordance with CPIOZ B. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Impacts associated with landform alteration would be less than significant, as future development would be required to comply with the relevant land use and development regulations, grading ordinance, ESL regulations, and relevant land use and development design guidelines and policies of the General Plan and CPU. Impacts were determined to be less than significant.

The 2013 Program EIR identified that the CPU could result in a negative visual appearance due to the loss, covering, or modification of any unique physical features such as a natural canyon or hillside slope in excess of 25 percent gradient Future development would be required to comply with relevant development regulations, ESL regulations, and relevant land use and development design guidelines and policies of the General Plan and CPU. Therefore, impacts were determined to be less than significant. Overall, adherence to existing policies and regulations, as well as implementation of the CPU policies would ensure that potential impacts would be below a level of significance.

#### Project

According to Figure 5.2-8 of the 2013 Program EIR, there are no view corridors or gateway areas adjacent to or near the project site. The nearest gateway location is located south of the project site, south of SR-905. While public views along roadways exist throughout the CPU area, the public roadways adjacent to the project site have not been designated as such. Scenic amenities, such as public views of canyons and mesas, are not within the viewshed of the project site, and are not visible from public view points, such as Otay Mesa Road and SR-905; thus, the project would not block views of these resources from these public viewing areas. The proposed retaining wall would be located along the southern border of the project site, adjacent to SR-905, and ranges from 2 to 7 feet in height. However, as discussed above, this roadway has not been designated as a public view corridor; as such, the construction of this retaining wall would not result in significant impacts to public views from this roadway. Therefore, impacts associated with public views would be less than significant.

The project site is located within the "Northwest District" of the Otay Mesa community, as shown in Figure 2-2 of the CPU. Much of the Northwest District (e.g., Ocean View Hills) has already been graded and built and is not visually sensitive. As discussed in the 2013 Program EIR, the areas proposed for development within the Northwest District are already graded and the existing graded lots are not visually sensitive, and development of these graded areas would improve their visual compatibility with the surrounding areas. Development of the PA 61 site would not introduce a use and development form incompatible with the character of this neighborhood, as it would introduce commercial and multi-family residential land uses which are present in the surrounding area. Surrounding development includes residential apartments to the north of the project site, as well as vacant land to the northeast and northwest, south, and east. The apartment complex to the north of the project site is similar in size and scale in relation to the proposed development plans for the project. As such, the project would not introduce a new or incompatible use or building form. The project would comply with all relevant land use and development design guidelines and policies of the General Plan and CPU and Precise Plan, as detailed in the project's design guidelines. Therefore, development of the site would be consistent with the existing surrounding development in terms of bulk and scale and would not result in an adverse aesthetic impact to the community. Impacts would be less than significant.

Regarding unique physical features, the project site does not contain any unique physical features such as a natural canyon or natural hillside slopes. The project site contains slopes in excess of 25 percent grading in the northwest corner of the project site where prior grading created steep slopes to construct a detention basin associated with VTM No. 86-1032. While these slopes have a gradient in excess of 25 percent and will be disturbed as part of project grading, they are not natural slopes and do not constitute a unique physical feature. While the City's ESL regulations prohibits grading into steep hillsides that contain slopes greater than 25 percent, the slopes on the project site do not meet the definition of steep hillsides as they are not natural slopes (SDMC Section 113.0103). Thus, the project would not conflict with the steep hillside regulations of the LDC.

In order to implement the project, additional refined grading would be required to implement the proposed project. Grading for the project would require a net import of 28,700 cubic yards of soil, and the maximum slope of cut and fill slopes would be at a 2:1 ratio at a 6-foot height.

In regard to applicable development design guidelines and policies, the Otay Mesa Community Plan includes Conservation Element Policies 8.1-1 through 8.1-3 related to ESL and landform alteration. These policies require the implementation of the ESL regulations related to biological resources and steep hillsides for all new development. The project would not conflict with ESL regulations related to biological resources as it would implement mitigation measures to ensure protection of burrowing owls during grading. Additionally, the project site does not contain ESL steep hillsides, undisturbed canyon areas, or mesa tops. Thus, the project would not conflict with ESL regulations. The project would comply with CPU Policy 8.1-3, which calls for the planning of development to minimize grading and relate to the topography and natural features of the CPU area, as the project would minimize grading to the extent needed to build the proposed structures and grading would not affect any surrounding natural features. In regard to applicable General Plan policies, the project would comply with Policy UD-A.6 and UD-A.8 by creating a street frontage lined with shade producing street trees\_along Otay Mesa Road that includes a noncontiguous sidewalk and landscaped area to provide visual appeal and an enhanced pedestrian experience, while constructing a multi-use apartment complex adjacent to existing multi-family developments.

As shown in grading and development plans, the project would be in compliance with landform grading guidelines contained in the City Grading Regulation, ESL Regulations, and Steep Hillside Guidelines of the LDC. Thus, impacts to landform alteration would be less than significant, and no new or more severe impacts would result.

Based on the foregoing analysis and information, there is no evidence that the project would require a major change to the 2013 Program EIR. The project would not result in a new significant impact, nor would a substantial increase in the severity of impacts from that described in the 2013 Program EIR occur.

#### **Air Quality**

## 2013 Program EIR

Section 5.3 of the 2013 Program EIR provides an analysis of air quality impacts associated with CPU.

The 2013 Program EIR determined that development occurring as a result of implementing the CPU would not obstruct or conflict with the implementation of the San Diego Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) or applicable portion of the State Implementation Plan (SIP), as the changes in land uses under the CPU and the traffic generated under the CPU would result in fewer emissions than the adopted community plan upon which the current RAQS is based, resulting in a less than significant impact.

The 2013 Program EIR concluded that the CPU could result in air quality impacts related to criteria pollutant emissions from construction and operation of a project within the CPU area. The 2013 Program EIR included mitigation measure AQ-1, which would require best available control measures/technology to be implemented during construction activities when construction emissions would exceed applicable thresholds, and mitigation measure AQ-2, which would require any future projects that significantly impact air quality to be conditioned with all reasonable mitigation to avoid, minimize, or offset the impact and to buffer sensitive receptors through the use of landscaping, open space or other techniques. However, the 2013 Program EIR determined that, while the mitigation framework and CPU policies would reduce emissions, future projects may not be able to reduce air emissions below the City's threshold. Therefore, impacts associated with criteria pollutant emissions would remain significant and unavoidable.

The 2013 Program EIR identified impacts to sensitive receptors associated with carbon monoxide (CO) hotspots and diesel particulate matter (DPM) would be less than significant, as there would be no harmful concentrations of CO and localized air quality emissions would not exceed applicable standards, and the chronic risks resulting from diesel exhaust emissions associated with the vehicles operating within and adjacent to the CPU are projected to be less than significant and would not expose future residents or workers to significant cancer risk from traffic-generated diesel exhaust emissions.

Industrial uses could generate air pollutants, and without appropriate controls, air emissions associated with planned industrial uses could represent a significant adverse air quality impact as it relates to stationary sources. The 2013 Program EIR included mitigation measure AQ-3, which requires an emissions inventory and health risk assessment to be prepared or any new facility that would have the potential to emit toxic air contaminants. However, even with implementation of the mitigation framework, impacts associated with stationary source emissions would remain significant and unavoidable. In addition, the 2013 Program EIR determined that impacts associated with collocation of sensitive receptors with commercial and industrial uses could result in exposure of sensitive receptors to toxic air emissions, resulting in a significant impact. The 2013 Program EIR included mitigation measure AQ-4, which requires a health risk assessment to be prepared for any project locating sensitive receptors closer than their recommended buffer distances to toxic air emitters. However, this impact likewise would remain significant and unavoidable.

The 2013 Program EIR concluded that there are no known sources of specific, long-term odors within the community plan area, and that none of the identified land uses would typically be associated with the creation of objectionable odors. In addition, the 2013 Program EIR concluded that since the CPU did not include any new sources of odor that would affect sensitive receptors, impacts associated with odors would be less than significant.

# Project

A project-specific Air Quality Analysis was prepared by RECON Environmental, Inc. (RECON 2019a) to assess impacts associated with air quality emissions associated with the project consistent with the 2013 Program EIR mitigation framework. The technical report evaluated existing conditions of the project vicinity, potential impacts associates with project construction, and an evaluation of project operational impacts. The following is a summary of the report.

According to the Otay Mesa CPU, the existing Community Commercial designation of the site allows for shopping areas with retail, service, civic, and office uses with a floor area ratio of 0.3. Therefore, an approximately 192,000-square-foot retail use could be constructed under the adopted land use designations. Applying a trip generation rate of 120 trips per 1,000 square feet for a neighborhood shopping center, a retail use would generate 23,040 daily trips, which is significantly greater than the 6,816 average daily traffic (ADT) generated by the project (LOS Engineering, Inc. 2019). A community plan amendment to redesignate the site from Community Commercial – Residential Prohibited to Community Commercial – Residential Permitted and a REZONE from CC-1-3 to RM-3-7. However, the project would generate less emissions than the adopted land use designation upon which the current RAQS is based upon. Therefore, project would not obstruct or conflict with the implementation of the RAQS. Impacts would be less than significant.

Construction-related activities are temporary, short-term sources of air emissions. Sources of construction-related emissions include fugitive dust from grading activities, equipment exhaust, trips, and power consumption. Construction emissions for the project were modeled assuming that construction would begin in January 2019 and last for approximately 18 months. The analysis concluded that projected construction maximum daily emission levels for criteria pollutants would not exceed the City's significance determination thresholds. Therefore, as project construction emissions would be below these limits, project construction would not result in emissions that would exceed the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) or California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS), or contribute to existing violations, resulting in a less than significant impact. Also, the project would not result in the generation of 100 pounds per day or more of particulate matter. Standard dust control measures would be implemented as a part of project construction. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Operations emissions generated by the project would come from area and energy sources (consumer products, landscape maintenance, architectural coatings, natural gas use, etc.), as well a mobile source (vehicle traffic). The project would generate a total of 6,816 trips (LOS Engineering, Inc. 2019). Based on the analysis, operational emissions would not exceed the City's significance determination thresholds. Therefore, as project operational emissions would be below the significance limits, project operation would not result in regional emissions that would exceed the NAAQS or CAAQS or contribute to existing violations, and operation emission impacts would be less than significant.

The project would be located within 500 feet of the centerline of SR-905, which is a heavily traveled roadway which could expose sensitive receptors to toxic air contaminants (diesel particulate matter). As called for by General Plan Policy LU-I.14, and in compliance with the policy direction of Otay Mesa CPU Policies 4.1-8 and 8.7-5, a site-specific health risk assessment was prepared for the project (RECON 2019a). The analysis is based on assumptions regarding emissions from diesel-fueled truck traffic on SR-905. The analysis concluded that the project would result in a 27.4 in a million excess

cancer risk for the maximally exposed individual and the non-cancer chronic risk would be 0.008, which is below the level of 1.0 at which adverse non-cancer health risks would be anticipated. However, as the risk at the multi-family buildings exceeds 10 in one million, as a design feature, the project would include minimum efficiency reporting value (MERV) 13 filters. MERV 13 filters are capable of filtering particles ranging from 1.0 to 10.0 parts per million (ppm) in size by more than 90 percent All units would be equipped with a heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) unit with air filters capable of meeting MERV-13 or better. Thus, with the provision of MERV-13 filters, the potential incremental increase in cancer risk would be reduced. It should be noted that the variability in parameters such as absorption rates, breathing rates, body weight, and frequency of exposure exists even in a narrowly defined age group or sensitive receptor subpopulation. This creates a level of uncertainty in calculating exposures and associated risks for individuals within a particular receptor population that presumably would receive the same intake doses. Thus, for this analysis the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment standard default factors, which represent the upper limit of these exposure parameters, generally overestimate risks. Thus, the risks reported represent an upper bound of estimated risk and are considered conservative, and impacts would be less than significant.

The project does not include heavy industrial or agricultural uses that are typically associated with objectionable odors. The project would involve the use of diesel-powered construction equipment. Diesel exhaust may be noticeable temporarily at adjacent properties; however, construction activities would be temporary. Therefore, odor impacts would be less than significant.

Based on the foregoing analysis and information, there is no evidence that the project would require a major change to the 2013 Program EIR. The project would not result in a new significant impact, nor would a substantial increase in the severity of impacts from that described in the 2013 Program EIR occur.

# **Biological Resources**

# 2013 Program EIR

Section 5.4 of the 2013 Program EIR provides an analysis of biological resource impacts associated with the CPU. The 2013 Program EIR stated that implementation of the CPU has the potential to impact sensitive plants and animals directly through the loss of habitat or indirectly by placing development adjacent to the MHPA. Potential impacts to federal or state listed species, MSCP covered species, or species with a California Native Plant Society (CNPS) Rare Plant Ranking would be significant. In addition, the 2013 Program EIR concluded that future projects would be required to implement a mitigation framework including BIO-1, which requires site-specific biological surveys to determine the potential for sensitive species, along with the provision for the proposal for sitespecific mitigation, if necessary, to reduce impacts to sensitive species or habitats. Specifically, BIO-1 requires future projects to conduct a habitat assessment to determine whether or not protocol surveys are needed. Should burrowing owl habitat or sign be encountered on or within 150 meters of the project site, breeding season surveys shall be conducted. If occupancy is determined, sitespecific avoidance and mitigation measures shall be developed. Measures to avoid and minimize impacts to burrowing owl shall be included in a Conceptual Burrowing Owl Mitigation Plan, which includes take avoidance (pre-construction) surveys, site surveillance, and the use of buffers, screens, or other measures to minimize construction-related impacts. Implementation of the mitigation framework would ensure that impacts to sensitive plants and animals would be less than significant.

The 2013 Program EIR concluded that future development, including construction or extension of CPU Mobility Element roadways, utility lines, and/or temporary construction activities within the MHPA, has the potential to interfere with nesting, reduce foraging habitat, and obstruct wildlife movement as a result of noise, construction activities, habitat loss, and/or fragmentation. Any direct or indirect impacts to migratory wildlife nesting, foraging, and movement was determined to be significant. The 2013 Program EIR's mitigation framework includes measure BIO-2, which requires a site-specific biological resource survey for projects that may have a potential to impact to areas within the MHPA. Implementation of this mitigation measure would ensure impacts would be less than significant.

The 2013 Program EIR determined that future projects within the CPU area could result in significant impacts to sensitive habitat, specifically to Tier I, II, and IIIB habitat areas, which include maritime succulent scrub, native grassland, Diegan coastal sage scrub, non-native grassland, riparian scrub, vernal pools, and basins with fairy shrimp. Measure BIO-1 would reduce impacts to sensitive habitat to a less than significant level. In addition, compliance with CPU polices and established development standards and regulations would reduce impacts to sensitive habitats to a less than significant level.

The 2013 Program EIR identified potential impacts to sensitive vegetation communities and species as a result of MHPA boundary adjustments would be less than significant because any adjustments would be required to meet the equivalency criteria for approval. In addition, MHPA adjacency impacts would be addressed at the project-level, and projects adjacent to MHPA areas would be required to comply with the MHPA Land Use Adjacency Guidelines and implement mitigation measure LU-2, which would reduce MHPA adjacency impacts to a less than significant level. The 2013 Program EIR also determined that the CPU would be consistent with the vision for the Otay Mesa MHPA as the open space network would remain intact and the CPU incorporates policies for adhering to the Management Directives, and no significant impacts relating to MSCP consistency would occur.

In regard to invasive plant impacts, the 2013 Program EIR determined that impacts could be potentially significant due to the introduction of invasive plants within the MHPA during future grading and development. The 2013 Program EIR determined that the introduction of invasive species into the MHPA would be addressed at the project level, and would be mitigated through implementation of the mitigation framework measure LU-2, reducing impacts to a less than significant level.

The 2013 Program EIR concluded that future projects implemented in accordance with the CPU may result in significant impacts to wetlands, vernal pools and vernal pool species, as well as both wetland and non-wetland streambed waters regulated by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), and the City of San Diego, and would thus require a deviation from the ESL Regulations. The 2013 Program EIR determined that future projects implemented in accordance with the CPU which cannot demonstrate compliance with CPIOZ A because impacts to wetlands/jurisdictional resources cannot be avoided would be required to implement mitigation measure BIO-4, which would reduce impacts to wetlands to a less than significant level.

The 2013 Program EIR determined that there is a potential for temporary noise impacts to wildlife from construction and permanent noise impacts from the introduction of noise generating land uses adjacent to MHPA. Temporary and/or permanent noise impacts to wildlife within the MHPA would be significant. The 2013 Program EIR determined that impacts to sensitive wildlife species (including temporary and permanent noise impacts) resulting from future projects implemented in accordance with the CPU would be mitigated to a less than significant level with implementation of mitigation measures BIO-1 through BIO-4 and LU-2.

# Project

Consistent with the 2013 Program EIR mitigation framework for the CPU, a Western Burrowing Owl Non-Breeding Survey was completed for the project by RECON Environmental, Inc. (RECON 2018a) in order to determine the presence or absence of the species within the project boundaries. The following is a brief summary of the analysis and conclusions of the technical study.

The project site is a previously graded, relatively flat site with a detention basin and earthen berms around the eastern and southern perimeters. The project site supports one land cover type, disturbed lands dominated mainly by Russian thistle (*Salsola tragus*). Other plant species present include red brome (*Bromus madritensis*), Australian saltbush (*Atriplex semibaccata*), crystalline iceplant (*Mesembryanthemum crystallinum*), and stinkwort (*Dittrichia graveolens*. None of the plant species are identified as sensitive according to the City's Biology Guidelines.

As the site consists of disturbed land, and the closest recent observation of nesting burrowing owls occurred in 2017, approximately 2.5 miles east of the project site, the site could support burrowing owls.

Based on the surveys conducted, although no burrowing owls were detected during the three surveys conducted, a burrow complex comprised of seven burrows was observed within the eastern portion of the site during the first survey. The second survey observed that the seven burrow complexes appeared to have been dug out and/or were collapsed due to predators. During the third and fourth surveys, several newly excavated burrows were observed within the same area, indicating that fossorial mammals were present within the project site. At the time of the surveys, no burrowing owl sign (e.g., cast pellets, prey remains, molted feathers, excrement at burrow entrances, etc.) was detected within or near the burrows.

Although western burrowing owls were not detected within the project, there is a moderate potential for the species to occur within the western portion of the project site, as the habitat is less dense and suitable burrows are present. Within the rest of the project site, there is low potential for burrowing owl to occur due to the density and height of the Russian thistle. The disturbed land within the buffer to the west and to the east of the project site also has a moderate potential for this species. Consequently, preconstruction burrowing owl surveys would be required.

Consequently, preconstruction burrowing owl surveys would be required, consistent with the 2013 Program EIR Mitigation Framework (Mitigation No. BIO-1) to determine absence or presence. Therefore, impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance. A Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, as detailed within Section VI of the Addendum, would be implemented to reduce impacts related to biological resources to below a level of significance.

Based on the foregoing analysis and information, there is no evidence that the project would require a major change to the 2013 Program EIR. The project would not result in a new significant impact, nor would a substantial increase in the severity of impacts from that described in the 2013 Program EIR occur.

#### **Historical Resources**

### 2013 Program EIR

Section 5.5 of the 2013 Program EIR provides an analysis of historical resource impacts associated with the CPU. The 2013 Program EIR determined that future development would have the potential to significantly impact all or a portion of the previously identified recorded prehistoric or historic sites within the CPU area. The 2013 Program EIR stated that future discretionary development projects could result in a potentially significant impact to prehistoric or historic resources and would be required to apply the Mitigation Framework for Historical Archaeological Resources, including measures HIST-1 and HIST-2.

The 2013 Program EIR determined that future development would have the potential to significantly impact religious or sacred sites within the CPU area. Development proposals requiring discretionary approval would be required to the Mitigation Framework for Historical Archaeological Resources, including measures HIST-1.

The 2013 Program EIR determined that future development would have the potential to significantly impact human remains within the CPU area. The 2013 Program EIR stated that future discretionary projects would be required to implement the Mitigation Framework for Historical Archaeological Resources, including measures HIST-1.

# Project

Significant archaeological sites were identified in the 1994 California Terraces EIR within the development area for the California Terraces Precise Plan; however, all archaeological sites were either placed in open space, tested, and found not to be significant, or were mitigated through completion of data recovery. Although all identified archaeological sites within the California Terraces Precise Plan area have been fully mitigated, the project site is located within an area that is known to support potentially significant cultural resources. The project site has been subject to prior grading in conjunction with the grading permit issued for VTM No. 86-1032. The geotechnical report prepared by GEOCON, Inc. (GEOCON 2018) for the project determined that the project site is underlain by previously placed fill to a depth of one to five feet, unmapped topsoil to a depth of two to five feet, and Very Old Paralic Deposits (Baypoint Formation), and San Diego Formation. Although the site is not likely to contain archaeological resources based on prior site disturbance and prior mitigation for archaeological sites completed as part of the California Terraces EIR, the area is known to contain cultural resources. The project would involve approximately 15,100 cubic yards of cut and would excavate to a maximum depth of four feet. Consequently, monitoring during grounddisturbing activities would be required, consistent with the 2013 Program EIR Mitigation Framework (Mitigation HIST-1).

A Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, as detailed within Section VI of the Addendum, would be implemented to reduce impacts related to biological resources to below a level of significance.

Based on the foregoing analysis and information, there is no evidence that the project would require a major change to the 2013 Program EIR. The project would not result in a new significant impact, nor would a substantial increase in the severity of impacts from that described in the 2013 Program EIR occur.

## Health and Safety/Hazardous Materials

#### 2013 Program EIR

Section 5.6 of the 2013 Program EIR provides an analysis of health and safety/hazardous materials impacts associated with the CPU. The 2013 Program EIR identified impacts associated with wildfire hazards that would be potentially significant because new development in the wildland interface areas may expose people and structures to wildland fire hazards, representing a potentially significant impact at the program level. The 2013 Program EIR included a mitigation framework with measure HAZ-1, which would reduce potential wildfire hazard impacts to a less than significant level. In addition, the 2013 Program EIR determined that impacts associated with aircraft hazards would be potentially significant at the program level, as future projects developed in accordance with the CPU have the potential to conflict with FAA requirements and result in a significant aircraft hazards impact. The mitigation framework contained in the 2013 Program EIR included measure HAZ-2, which would reduce potential aircraft hazard impacts to a less than significant at level.

The 2013 Program EIR concluded that impacts associated with hazardous substances would be less than significant, as future projects within the CPU area would be required to comply with policies contained in the General Plan, the CPU, and regulations imposed by federal, state, and local agencies, including the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA), Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA), California Department of Health Services, County of San Diego Department of Environmental Health (DEH), and the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). In addition, the CPU designated truck routes within the CPU area along roadway improvements in conjunction with buildout of the circulation network, which would reduce the potential risk of exposure from hazardous materials to residents as a result of transporting hazardous materials. Compliance with existing regulations would ensure impacts associated with health hazards and hazardous substances remain less than significant.

The 2013 Program EIR determined that impacts associated with hazardous sites would be potentially significant, as the Program EIR identified six sites within the CPU area as containing hazardous materials, which would present a significant hazard to the public or the environment. In addition, the presence of unknown hazardous sites within the CPU could result in significant impacts to future development within the CPU area. The mitigation framework contained in the 2013 Program EIR included measure HAZ-3, which would reduce potential hazardous site impacts to a less than significant level.

# Project

The project site is located within a designated Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone, per the City of San Diego Official Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone Map. However, the project site is surrounded by major roads on three sides including Otay Mesa Road to the north, Caliente Road to the west, and SR-905 and the SR-905 off-ramp to the south. Land uses surrounding the project site includes commercial and multi-family residential to the north, vacant land to the east, and existing roadways (SR-905, Caliente Road, and Otay Mesa Road). The project is over 100 feet from a wildland urban interface area; and therefore, a formalized brush management plan is not required per SDMC 142.0412.

The project site is located within the Airport Influence Area - Review Area 2 for Brown Field Municipal Airport, and within the FAA Part 77 Notification Area for Brown Field Municipal Airport. The aeronautical study number 2018-AWP-14787, issued on November 9, 2018, by the Federal Aviation Administration determined that the proposed project does not exceed obstruction standards and would not be a hazard to air navigation. Furthermore, the project site is not located within a Safety Zone as depicted in the 2010 Brown Field Municipal Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan; as such, hazards associated with aircraft would be less than significant.

During project construction, small amounts of solvents and petroleum products could be utilized; and although minimal amounts of such substances may be present during construction, they are not anticipated to result in a significant hazard to the public. During the operational phase of the project, the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials is not anticipated. Although small amounts of hazardous materials may be used for cleaning and maintenance, standard BMPs would be applied to ensure that all hazardous materials are handled and disposed of properly and that no hazards would result during the long-term operation of the project. Hazardous materials and waste would be managed and used in accordance with all applicable federal, state, and local laws and regulations; the project would not be a significant hazard to the public or environment. Additionally, appropriate handling techniques shall be implemented for any unknown subsurface discoveries, to meet local, state, and federal regulations. Impacts would be less than significant.

A review of the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) Geotracker (SWRCB 2018) and Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) Envirostor (DTSC 2018) databases was conducted for the project site. Based on the searches conducted, the project site does not contain any contaminated sites on or adjacent to the site. Furthermore, the project site was not identified on the Department of Toxic Substance Control Cortese List. Based on Table 5.6-1 of the 2013 Program EIR, there is one property of environmental concern, noted as the Otay Mesa Widening Project, with an identified location adjacent to north and south of Otay Mesa Road. Although the 2013 Program EIR did not identify whether this property of environmental concern is located within the project site, it stated that no mitigation measures are anticipated to be required should project grading within the vicinity of this site be needed.

If grading of the project site were to encounter any hazardous materials within the soil under the project site, the project would be required to comply with policies contained in the General Plan, the CPU, and regulations imposed by federal, state, and local agencies, including the U.S. EPA, RCRA, California Department of Health Services, County of San Diego DEH, and Caltrans. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Based on the foregoing analysis and information, there is no evidence that the project would require a major change to the 2013 Program EIR. The project would not result in a new significant impact, nor would a substantial increase in the severity of impacts from that described in the 2013 Program EIR occur.

## Hydrology and Water Quality

### 2013 Program EIR

Section 5.7 of the 2013 Program EIR provides an analysis of hydrology and water quality impacts associated with the CPU. The 2013 Program EIR identified impacts associated with runoff that would result in significant direct and indirect impacts due to an increase in impervious surfaces and associated increases in runoff, and the alterations of on- and off-site drainage patterns. The 2013 Program EIR included a mitigation framework including measure HYD/WQ-1, which requires regulatory compliance with the Storm Water Standards Manual. Future projects would be required to implement this measure and would reduce impacts associated with runoff to a less than significant level.

The 2013 Program EIR determined that impacts to natural drainage systems would be potentially significant, as buildout in accordance with the CPU has the potential to result in a substantial change to stream flow velocities and drainage patterns on downstream properties. The 2013 Program EIR mitigation framework included measure HYD/WQ-1, which requires regulatory compliance with the Storm Water Standards Manual, would reduce impacts to natural drainage systems to a less than significant level.

The 2013 Program EIR concluded that impacts associated with flow alteration would be potentially significant, as future development within the CPU area would potentially impact the existing course and flow of flood waters due to the presence of floodplains within the CPU area. The 2013 Program EIR mitigation framework included mitigation measure HYD/WQ-1, which requires regulatory compliance with the Storm Water Standards Manual, and would reduce impacts associated with flow alteration to a less than significant level.

The 2013 Program EIR determined that impacts to water quality would be potentially significant, as future projects constructed during buildout of the CPU could result in discharges to surface water or groundwater. Grading and exposed soil could result in sedimentation. Residential development could result in the discharge of sediment, nutrients, trash and debris, oxygen-demanding substances, oil and grease, pesticides, and bacteria and viruses. Commercial development could result in discharge of sediment, nutrients, organic compounds, oxygen- demanding substances, pesticides, and bacteria and viruses. Projects would be required to prepare a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). Development of parks, schools, roads, and other public infrastructure would contribute to any of the identified pollutants noted above. The 2013 Program EIR mitigation framework included measure HYD/WQ-2, which would reduce impacts associated with water quality to a less than significant level.

## Project

Consistent with the 2013 Program EIR mitigation framework as well as City regulations, a sitespecific Preliminary Drainage Report (Drainage Report) and Storm Water Quality Management Plan (SWQMP) were completed by Chang Consultants (Chang Consultants 2018a and 2018b, respectively) consistent with the mitigation framework.

The Preliminary Drainage Report assessed pre- and post-project runoff conditions for the project site. Under existing, pre-project conditions, storm runoff from the site flows over the gently sloping, natural ground surface. The majority of the flow is directed to the east and onto the adjacent parcel. The on- and off-site runoff continue easterly as sheet flow towards a small watercourse approximately 1,400 feet east of the site. There is a historic pond that was graded within the northeast corner of the site that captures precipitation within its footprint. The remaining site runoff is directed towards the northwest corner of the site (towards the intersection of Otay Mesa Road and Caliente Avenue) and into an existing storm drain system. There are no other existing on-site drainage facilities and there is minimal off-site run-on.

Under post-project conditions storm runoff would be conveyed by the private alleys and driveways to on-site storm drain systems. The majority of the runoff would be conveyed towards the northeast corner of the site where the proposed on-site storm drain would connect to an existing storm drain in Otay Mesa Road about 500 feet east of the site. The existing storm drain outlets into a natural watercourse within Dennery Canyon on the north site of Otay Mesa Road. The watercourse continues north to the Otay River, which flows into San Diego Bay. Post-project storm runoff from the northwest corner of the project site would be conveyed by the proposed streets and storm drain system to an existing storm drain system at the intersection of Caliente Avenue and Otay Mesa Road. Storm runoff from the westerly pad would also enter this storm drain system, before out letting into a natural watercourse within Dennery Canyon, continuing to the Otay River, which flows into San Diego Bay.

Preliminary hydraulic analyses were performed to estimate sizing of the public storm drain system; the analysis concluded that the project would increase the 100-year flow rate, which is anticipated since the undeveloped site would be developed with structures as well as other impermeable surfaces. Table 4 below identifies the pre- and post-project drainage area and 100-year flow rates.

Table 4					
Existing and Proposed Hydrological Conditions					
Duningge Basing	Drainage Area (acres) 100-Year Flow (cfs)				
Drainage Basins	Existing	Proposed	Existing	Proposed	
Easterly	11.66	9.42	12	21	
Westerly	3.19	5.43	4.3	8.4	
cfs = cubic feet per second					

As shown, the project would increase the 100-year flow rate by 13.1 cfs. Detention would not be required for the easterly flows; detention would be designed for the westerly flows as needed, and identified during final engineering, showing compliance with the requirements of the City's Storm Water Standards Manual. Therefore, the project would result in less than significant impacts associated with drainage.

According to the City's Storm Water Requirements Applicability Checklist, the project is considered to be a Priority Development Project; and therefore, prepared a Storm Water Quality Management

Plan (SWQMP) to identify and implement required structural BMPs for storm water pollutant control (BMP Design Manual Chapter 5, Part 1 of Storm Water Standards) as well as low impact development source control BMPs. Site design features would include minimizing impervious area, minimizing soil compaction, dispersing impervious areas, and landscaping with native or drought-tolerant species. The project proposes to use treat runoff by MWS Linear BMPs. An MWS Linear BMP would be installed at five locations as shown on the DMA and Hydromodification Management Exhibit in the project's SWQMP. 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 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.

Overall, BMPs would be utilized within the project site to ensure that potential impacts associated with water quality would be less than significant.

Based on the foregoing analysis and information, there is no evidence that the project would require a major change to the 2013 Program EIR. The project would not result in a new significant impact, nor would a substantial increase in the severity of impacts from that described in the 2013 Program EIR occur.

## **Geology/Soils**

#### 2013 Program EIR

Section 5.8 of the 2013 Program EIR provides an analysis of geology and soils impacts associated with the CPU. The Program EIR determined that the CPU is within a moderate to high geologic risk area and could therefore result in the exposure of persons or structures to seismic events associated with fault. Faults within the immediate CPU area are generally considered to comprise the La Nación Fault Zone. Faults in this zone are considered to be potentially active and would subject the CPU area to moderate to severe ground shaking, resulting in a potentially significant impact. Regarding compressible soils, the 2013 Program EIR determined that portions of the CPU area are underlain by undocumented fill, colluvium/topsoil, and alluvium, which are typically lose, dry and contain rubble and are considered compressible. For future projects underlain by compressible soils, removal and replacement by compacted fill would be required. In regard to expansive soils, the 2013 Program EIR determined that the CPU area contains clay mudstone strata within the Very Old Paralic Deposits that exhibit a high to very high expansion potential, which occur over the majority of the CPU area, resulting in a potentially significant impact. No significant impacts were identified for potential rockfall hazards, and no rock stabilization or blasting would be required for future projects within the CPU area. The 2013 Program EIR Mitigation Framework included measure GEO-1, which requires preparation of a site-specific geotechnical report recommending project-specific engineering design measures which would reduce potential geologic hazard impacts to a less than significant level.

The 2013 Program EIR determined that impacts associated with erosion would be potentially significant, due to the steep nature of many of the hillsides and the generally poorly consolidated nature of the sedimentary materials and soils found throughout the CPU area, particularly in conjunction with some portions of the San Diego Formation and in drainages and stream valleys. The 2013 Program EIR Mitigation Framework included measure GEO-2, requires preparation of a

site-specific geotechnical report to ensure that projects adhere to the Grading Regulation and NPDES permit requirements. Implementation of this measure would reduce impacts associated with erosion to a less than significant level.

# Project

A site-specific Geotechnical Investigation was prepared for the project by GEOCON, Inc. (GEOCON 2018). According to the Geotechnical Investigation, the project site does not contain a known active, potentially active, or inactive fault, and is not located within a State of California Earthquake Fault Zone. In addition, the risk associated with liquefaction potential, subsidence, and flooding was determined to be low. As such, impacts associated with these geologic hazards are considered to be less than significant. The Geotechnical Investigation determined that the project site is underlain by undocumented fill and topsoil, which would be required to be removed and replaced as compacted fill prior to site development, thereby ensuring impacts associated with compressible soils would be less than significant.

Based on the results of the geotechnical investigation, the geologic consultant has adequately addressed the soil and geologic conditions potentially affecting the site; and therefore, it was concluded that the planned construction would be feasible from a geotechnical standpoint. Additionally, 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.

Regarding erosion, a SWQMP was prepared for the project by Chang Consultants (2018b) that includes measures to ensure that construction of the project would disrupt soil due to grading activity, thereby resulting in an increased exposure of soils to wind and rain, which could lead to erosion. Additionally, the project would adhere to the City's Grading Regulations and NPDES permit requirements. Conformance to mandated City grading requirements, the SWQMP, and the recommendations of the Geotechnical Investigation prepared for the project would ensure that impacts associated with future grading and construction operations would be less than significant.

Based on the foregoing analysis and information, there is no evidence that the project would require a major change to the 2013 Program EIR. The project would not result in a new significant impact, nor would a substantial increase in the severity of impacts from that described in the 2013 Program EIR occur.

#### **Energy Conservation**

# 2013 Program EIR

Section 5.9 of the 2013 Program EIR provides an analysis of energy conservation impacts associated with the CPU. The 2013 Program EIR concluded that impacts associated with energy conservation would be less than significant, as implementation of the CPU would not result in the use of excessive amounts of fuel or other forms of energy during the construction of future projects under the CPU. In addition, the 2013 Program EIR concluded that implementation of the CPU would not be anticipated to result in a need for new electrical systems or require substantial alteration of existing utilities, which would create physical impacts. Based on the program-level analysis of the CPU, state

and local mandates for energy conservation, and the energy reduction measures set forth in the CPU policies. Impacts associated with energy use would be less than significant.

## Project

Energy used during construction of the proposed land uses would not be considered significant given the short-term nature of the energy consumption. In regard to long-term operational related energy consumption, although the project is proposing a CPA and rezone to allow for residential development within a site planned for commercial use, development of the project would not result in any new or more severe impacts related to electrical power or fuel consumption in comparison to what would be needed to accommodate the site if it was fully developed as a commercial operation.

The project would be required to meet the mandatory energy standards of the current California energy code as well as the Community Plan Urban Design Element, which contains a list of climate change and sustainable development policies that focus on designing new development to have a climate, energy efficient, and environmentally oriented site design. Additionally, construction of the project would consume energy through the operation of heavy off-road equipment, trucks, and worker traffic. However, construction emissions would not be greater than the emissions that would be associated with development of the site for a commercial use.

Since the project would be required to meet the mandatory energy standards of the current California energy code, Title 24 Building Energy Standards of the California Public Resources Code, and would be required to comply with energy conservation requirements of the CAP Checklist, the project would not result in energy use during the construction or operation that would result in any new or more severe impacts related to electrical power or fuel consumption.

Based on the foregoing analysis and information, there is no evidence that the project would require a major change to the 2013 Program EIR. The project would not result in a new significant impact, nor would a substantial increase in the severity of impacts from that described in the 2013 Program EIR occur.

## Noise

## 2013 Program EIR

Section 5.10 of the 2013 Program EIR provides an analysis of noise impacts associated with the CPU. The 2013 Program EIR determined that impacts associated with traffic noise would be significant, as noise sensitive land uses are proposed in areas where exterior noise levels would exceed the noise and land use compatibility standards established in Table N-3 of the General Plan. Exterior and potentially interior traffic noise impacts are anticipated at the majority of locations adjacent to I-805, SR-905, SR-125, Otay Mesa Road, and Airway Road. The 2013 Program EIR Mitigation Framework included measures NOI-1 and NOI-2 that would be required by future projects to demonstrate the exterior and interior noise levels for residential uses would not exceed the compatibility standards of the City's General Plan. These measures required site-specific exterior and interior noise analyses to identify site-specific noise attenuating measures; however, even with implementation of these measures, the 2013 Program EIR determined that traffic noise resulting from implementation of the CPU would not be compatible with the General Plan standards.

The 2013 Program EIR determined that impacts associated with stationary source noise would be significant, as the CPU has the potential to site noise-sensitive uses (i.e., residential) adjacent to noise-generating commercial and industrial uses. The 2013 Program EIR Mitigation Framework included measure NOI-3, which requires preparation and submittal of a site-specific acoustical/noise analysis to recommend site-specific noise attenuation measures; however, even with implementation of this measure, the 2013 Program EIR determined that impacts would remain significant and unavoidable at the program level.

The 2013 Program EIR determined that impacts associated with airport noise would be less than significant, as existing uses within the 60 and 65 community noise equivalent level (CNEL) noise contours from Brown Field would be considered conditionally compatible with these noise levels from operations as Brown Field and the General Abelardo L. Rodriguez International Airport.

The 2013 Program EIR determined that impacts associated with construction noise would be potentially significant, as construction activities related to implementation of the CPU would generate short-term noise impacts to noise-sensitive land uses located adjacent to construction sites. In addition, construction-related noise associated with future development projects within the CPU area could result in short-term, temporary noise impacts affecting coastal California gnatcatchers, raptors, and other sensitive species within the MHPA. In order to reduce potentially significant impacts associated with construction noise, the 2013 Program EIR Mitigation Framework included measures NOI-4 (and LU-2) requiring the implementation of best construction management practices, including preparation of a project-specific Construction Noise Management Plan; however, impacts were determined to remain significant and unavoidable.

## Project

Consistent with the 2013 Program EIR Mitigation Framework, a site-specific Noise Analysis was prepared for the project by RECON Environmental, Inc. (RECON 2019b). The technical study analyzed the existing and future noise environments. The technical report is summarized below.

The primary noise sources in the vicinity of the project site is vehicular traffic on adjacent and nearby roadways from SR-905, Otay Mesa Road, and Ocean View Hills Parkway. The site is also exposed to aircraft noise levels less than 60 A-weighted decibels (dBA) CNEL from operations associated with the San Diego International Airport (SDIA). Existing ambient noise levels range from 61.5 decibels  $L_{eq}$  (one-hour equivalent noise level) at the western property line, 50 feet east of Caliente Avenue, to 75.9  $L_{eq}$ , at the southern property line, 150 feet north of SR-905.

Project construction noise would be generated by diesel engine-driven construction equipment used for site preparation and grading, building construction, loading, unloading, and placing materials and paving. Construction noise would potentially result in short-term impacts to surrounding properties. Construction noise levels are not anticipated to exceed 75 dB(A)  $L_{eq}$  at the adjacent or on-site residential uses, or 60 dB(A)  $L_{eq}$  within the closest MHPA habitat area. Although the existing adjacent residences and areas within MHPA would be exposed to construction noise levels that could be heard above ambient conditions, the exposure would be temporary. Additionally, construction activities are not anticipated to exceed 75 dB(A) $L_{eq}$ . As construction activities associated with the project would comply with noise level limits from Noise Abatement and Control Ordinance Section 59.5.0404, temporary increases in noise levels from construction activities would be less than significant.

Per the General Plan, multi-family residential uses are "compatible" with exterior noise levels up to 60 CNEL, and "conditionally compatible" with exterior noise levels up to 70 CNEL. In "conditionally compatible" areas, feasible noise mitigation techniques should be analyzed and incorporated to make the outdoor activities acceptable, and building structures must attenuate exterior noise levels to an indoor noise level of 45 CNEL. The exterior compatibility standard is applicable at the proposed exterior use areas. In the case of the project, exterior use areas include the balconies. Exterior noise levels were modeled at each proposed balcony location. Balcony noise levels are projected to exceed the "conditionally compatible" noise level of 70 CNEL at 27 of the balconies facing Otay Mesa Road and SR-905. Therefore, the project includes noise attenuating design measures in the form of a solid 3.5-foot balcony wall extending the length/perimeter of the balcony on the 27 balconies. The inclusion of the noise walls would ensure that the project would be consistent with City regulations associated with exterior noise levels.

The interior noise level standard for commercial uses is 50 CNEL. No site or building design is available for the commercial lot at this time. However, assuming light-frame construction, interior noise levels would be reduced to 49 CNEL. Thus, interior noise levels in the commercial buildings would be compatible with City standards. The interior noise level standard for residential uses is 45 CNEL. A noise reduction of up to 30 decibels (dB) would be required to achieve an interior noise level of 45 CNEL or less Prior to the issuance of building permits, a site-specific exterior to interior noise analysis would be prepared demonstrating that the window, door, and wall components would achieve a necessary sound transmission class rating required to reduce interior noise levels to 45 CNEL or less. With implementation of this existing mitigation framework, interior noise impacts would be less than significant.

The main source of noise at the project site is vehicle traffic on SR-905, Otay Mesa Road, Caliente Avenue, and SR-905 on- and off-ramps. SR-905 is a designated truck route that services the international industries and the Port of Entry on a daily basis. The exterior noise levels were modeled at the proposed park site and at the perimeter of the commercial lot. Noise levels at these areas would be compatible with the City's park and commercial standards, respectively.

In regard to stationary source noise, the main operational noise sources within the project site are anticipated to be those that would be typical of any residential complex, such as vehicles arriving and leaving and landscape maintenance machinery. None of these noise sources is anticipated to violate the City's Noise Abatement and Control Ordinance. Rooftop HVAC noise levels were modeled at the adjacent property lines, and on-site generated noise levels from HVAC systems would range from 33 to 38 A-weighted decibels average equivalent noise level [dB(A) L<sub>eq</sub>]. Noise levels would not exceed the applicable limits at the property lines. Impacts would be less than significant.

As it pertains to airport noise, the project site is not located within an identified noise contour for the Brown Field Municipal Airport, as depicted in Figure 5.1-4 of the 2013 Program EIR. No impact would occur.

Consequently, preconstruction burrowing owl surveys would be required, consistent with the 2013 Program EIR Mitigation Framework (Mitigation No. BIO-1) to determine absence or presence. Therefore, impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance. A Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, as detailed within Section VI of the Addendum, would be implemented to reduce impacts related to noise to below a level of significance.

Based on the foregoing analysis and information, there is no evidence that the project would require a major change to the 2013 Program EIR. The project would not result in a new significant impact, nor would a substantial increase in the severity of impacts from that described in the 2013 Program EIR occur.

## **Paleontological Resources**

## 2013 Program EIR

Section 5.11 of the 2013 Program EIR provides an analysis of paleontological resource impacts associated with the CPU, which concludes that impacts to paleontological resources would be potentially significant, as approximately 352 acres designated as high paleontological sensitivity, approximately 1,505 acres designated as moderate sensitivity, and less than 1 acre designated as low sensitivity would potentially be impacted by buildout of the CPU. As such, CPU implementation would result in grading that would impact paleontological resources. Future development subject to discretionary review would require project level analysis and construction monitoring. Implementation of this measure would reduce impacts to paleontological resources to a less than significant level.

## Project

According to the Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation prepared by GEOCON, Inc. (GEOCON 2018), the site is underlain by the undocumented fill, topsoil, Very Old Paralic Deposit (formally known as Baypoint Formation), and San Diego Formation. The artificial fill and topsoil have a zero-sensitivity rating, whereas Very Old Paralic Deposit has a moderate sensitivity rating and San Diego Formation has a high sensitivity rating for paleontological resources.

The project site was previously issued a grading permit and graded in accordance with VTM No. 86-1032, which showed grading of the entire PA 61 project area. However, the project would involve approximately 15,100 cubic yards of cut and would excavate to a maximum depth of four feet. Considering the moderate paleontological sensitivity rating of the underlying geologic formation encountered at a depth of two feet in borings conducted during the geotechnical investigation, the project grading activities have potential to disturb or destroy paleontological resources. Disturbance or loss of fossils would be considered a significant environmental impact. Therefore, consistent with the mitigation framework of the 2013 Program EIR monitoring would be required.

A Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, as detailed within Section VI of the Addendum, would be implemented to reduce impacts related to paleontological resources to below a level of significance.

Based on the foregoing analysis and information, there is no evidence that the project would require a major change to the 2013 Program EIR. The project would not result in a new significant impact, nor would a substantial increase in the severity of impacts from that described in the 2013 Program EIR occur.

## **Transportation/Circulation**

## 2013 Program EIR

Section 5.12 of the 2013 Program EIR provides an analysis of transportation/circulation impacts associated with the CPU. The 2013 Program EIR determined that impacts associated with capacity of the circulation system would be significant. Specifically, a total of 24 roadway segments under the Horizon Year Plus CPU condition would be expected to operate at unacceptable level of service (LOS), resulting in significant roadway segment impacts. A total of 49 intersections would be expected to operate at unacceptable levels under the Horizon Year Plus CPU condition, resulting in significant intersection impacts, and 39 intersections would remain significant after mitigation. The 2013 Program EIR determined that all Interstate 805 freeway segments studied would be expected to operate at an acceptable LOS in the Horizon Year Plus CPU condition, while five SR-905 freeway segments would be expected to operate at unacceptable levels at these five SR-906 freeway segments. In regard to freeway ramp metering impacts, the 2013 Program EIR determined that five SR-905 metered freeway on-ramps, including those within the PA 61 project area (SR-905 and Caliente Road) would be expected to experience delays over 15 minutes with downstream freeway operations at unacceptable levels in the Horizon timpact.

The 2013 Program EIR Mitigation Framework stated that at the program level, impacts would be reduced through the CPU proposed classifications of roadways and identification of necessary roadway, intersection, and freeway improvements. Specific mitigation measures or construction of these improvements would be carried out at the project-level via the City's PFFP and/or specific improvement proposals included as part of future development projects. Funding would be through construction by individual development projects, collection of Facilities Benefit Assessment fees, fair-share contributions to be determined at the project-level, and potentially other sources.

The 2013 Program EIR identified significant impacts at roadway segments throughout the CPU area. None of the road segments are within the PA 61 project study area. Even with incorporation of the recommended street classifications identified in Table 5.12-4 of the 2013 Program EIR, 24 roadway segments would operate unacceptably in the Horizon Year Plus CPU condition, resulting in a significant and unmitigated impacts to roadway segments. The 2013 Program EIR Mitigation Framework stated that partial mitigation may be possible in the form of transportation demand management measures that encourage carpooling and other alternate means of transportation. At the time future discretionary subsequent development projects are proposed, project-specific traffic analyses would be required to contain detailed recommendations.

The 2013 Program EIR identified significant impacts at 49 intersections throughout the CPU area. Of these intersections, the following are within the PA 61 project study area: Ocean View Hills Parkway/Del Sol Boulevard; Caliente Avenue/SR-905 eastbound and westbound ramps; Caliente Avenue/Airway Road; Otay Mesa Road/Corporate Center Road; Otay Mesa Road/Innovative Drive; and Otay Mesa Road/Heritage Road. The 2013 Program EIR Mitigation Framework included Measure TRF-1, which requires intersection improvements per the lane designations identified in the 2013 Program EIR Figures 5.12-4a through 5.12-4g. However, the 2013 Program EIR concludes that even with the lane configurations proposed for the intersections analyzed, 39 intersections would continue to be significant and unmitigated.

The 2013 Program EIR proposed mitigations for freeway segment impacts include the construction of high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) lane in each direction on the SR-905. However, because the affected freeway segments are owned and operated by Caltrans, mitigation to these segments can not be guaranteed by the City. Therefore, Additional mitigation such as Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures may be identified in the future at the project-level; however, impacts to the SR-905 mainline segments would remain significant and unmitigated.

At the time future development projects are proposed, project-specific traffic analyses would be required to contain detailed recommendations. All project-specific mitigation for direct impacts shall be implemented prior to the issuance of Certificate of Occupancy in order to provide mitigation at the time of impact; however, at the program level impacts would remain significant and unmitigated.

# Project

The following is based on a Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) completed by LOS Engineering, Inc., for the PA 61 project dated January 14, 2019 (LOS Engineering 2019).

#### Methodology

Potential traffic impacts were analyzed using the 2000 and 2010 Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) operations analysis using Level of Service (LOS) evaluation criteria and compared to the City of San Diego LOS criteria for intersections and roadway segments. The TIA was prepared utilizing a maximum buildout scenario of 267 multi-family residential units, 45,000 square feet of commercial space, and a 0.19-acre passive park within the project site. The TIA also evaluated potential impacts to freeway segments based on multi-lane highway LOS criteria using a volume to capacity (V/C) ratio as outlined in the 2000 HCM. Freeway LOS operations were based on the Caltrans' 2002 Guide for the Preparation of Traffic Impact Studies (December 2002) V/C ratios.

Because there are no operational on-ramp meters at Caliente Avenue/SR-905, the TIA does not include an on-ramp analysis for existing and near-term conditions. For horizon year conditions, a ramp meter analysis was prepared using the horizon year rate used in the 2013 Program EIR. A significant impact occurs if the queue is greater than 15 minutes and the downstream vehicular LOS is E or F.

# Significance Criteria

A project is considered to have caused a significant impact if the new project traffic has degraded an acceptable LOS to an unacceptable LOS (i.e., E or F) or has decreased the operations on the surrounding roadways by the City of San Diego defined thresholds.

## Project Trip Generation and Distribution

Table 5 shows the estimated trip generation for the project.

Land Use	Daily Rate	Size/Units	ADT	A	м	PI	М
				In	Out	In	Out
Driveway Trips							
Neighborhood Shopping Center	120/ksf	45,000 sf	5,400	130	86	297	297
Multi-Family (over 20 du/acre)	6/du	267 du	1,602	26	103	101	43
Developed Park	50/acre	0.19 acre	10	0	0	0	0
SANDAG Traffic Model Internal Capture 2.8%			-196	-4	-5	-11	-10
External Driveway Trips			6,816	152	184	387	330
Cumulative Trips							
Neighborhood Shopping Center	72/ksf	45,000 sf	3,240	78	52	178	178
Multi-Family (over 20 du/acre)	6/du	276 du	1,602	26	103	101	43
Developed Park	50/acre	0.19 acres	10	0	0	0	0
SANDAG Traffic Model Internal Capture 2.8%			-136	-3	-4	-8	-6
External Cumulative Trips			4,716	101	151	271	215
SANDAG = San Diego Association of Governments							
ksf = 1,000 square feet; du = dwelling unit; sf = square feet							

# Table 5 Project Trip Generation

Existing with Project Conditions (Direct Impact Assessment)

The street system included in the traffic analysis includes Caliente Avenue, Ocean View Hills Parkway, Otay Mesa Road, and SR-905, along with multi-modal transportation elements located near the project site, including existing Metropolitan Transit Service bus routes, existing and proposed bicycle lanes and routes, and pedestrian mobility facilities. Under existing conditions, the study intersections, street segments, and freeway segments were calculated to operate at LOS D or better except for the intersection of Caliente Avenue at Airway Road (LOS F AM). The Caliente Avenue/SR-905 on-ramps are not metered under the existing scenario.

The LOS operations for Existing with Project intersections, road segments and freeway segments are anticipated to operate at LOS D or better, with the exception of three intersections. The project would result in a significant impact at the following three intersections:

- Impact TRF-1: Caliente Avenue at the SR-905 westbound (WB) ramp (LOS E PM)
- Impact TRF-2: Caliente Avenue at Airway Road (LOS F AM), and
- Impact TRF-3: Otay Mesa Road at Emerald Crest Ct (LOS F PM).

No significant direct project impacts are expected to result at project area road segments or freeway mainline segments.

<u>Near-Term Opening Day Year 2020 with Project Conditions (Direct Impact Assessment)</u> This scenario documents the addition of project traffic onto near-term year 2020 traffic.

The LOS operations for Near-Term Opening Day 2020 with project intersection, segment and freeway operations are anticipated to operate at LOS D or better, with the exception of three intersections. The project would result in significant direct impacts at the following three intersections:

- Impact TRF-4: Caliente Avenue at the SR-905 WB ramp (LOS E PM),
- Impact TRF-5: Caliente Avenue at Airway Road (LOS F AM and PM), and
- Impact TRF-6: Otay Mesa Road at Emerald Crest Court (LOS E and F AM and PM).

No significant Opening Day 2020 direct project impacts would be expected to result at project area street segments or freeway mainline segments.

#### Horizon Year 2062 with Project Conditions (Cumulative Impact Assessment)

The Horizon Year 2062 with the Project Conditions scenario analyzes the addition of project traffic to Horizon Year 2062 volumes. The LOS operations for Horizon Year 2062 With Project intersection, segment and freeway operations are anticipated to operate at LOS D or better, with the exception of four intersections and one roadway segment. Under horizon year 2062 with Project Conditions, the following significant impacts would result:

- Impact TRF-7: Intersection of Otay Mesa Road/Ocean View Hills Parkway/Caliente Avenue (LOS E PM),
- Impact TRF-8: Intersection of Caliente Avenue/SR-905 Westbound Ramp (LOS F PM),
- Impact TRF-9: Intersection of Caliente Avenue at Airway Road (LOS F AM and PM),
- Impact TRF-10: Intersection of Otay Mesa Road at Emerald Crest Court (LOS F PM), and
- Impact TRF-11: Segment of Caliente Avenue between Otay Mesa Road and SR-905 WB Ramp (LOS F).

Metered freeway ramps were also analyzed at the westbound SR-905 On-Ramp in the AM and PM peak hours in the horizon year, which were calculated to operate with significant delays; however, the project would not be expected to result in a significant impact to the metered on-ramps because the downstream freeway operations are expected to be at LOS D or better.

Consistent with the 2013 Program EIR, the project would include mitigation measures as anticipated under the mitigation framework. The project would include Mitigation Measures TRF-1 through TRF-7 (see Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan, below) Mitigation Measures TRF-1 through TRF-3 would mitigate Impacts TRF-1 through TRF-6 to a less than significant level, while Mitigation Measures TRF-4 through TRF-7 would mitigate Impacts TRF-7 through TRF-7 through TRF-11.

#### Conclusion

The 2013 Program EIR identified Horizon Year community buildout impacts at 49 intersections throughout the community plan area including those identified above. As a programmatic document, the overall mitigation framework in the 2013 Program EIR is based on recommended future improvements to be funded through the City's PFFP and by future development projects as a means to mitigate traffic impacts. The 2013 Program EIR found, however, that even with

improvements, significant cumulative impacts would remain at 39 of the 49 identified intersections, including Caliente Road/WB SR-905 ramps. See Figure 5.12-4a-e in the 2013 Program EIR showing the intersection improvements (2013 Program EIR, Mitigation Measure TRF-1).

The impacts identified by the project-specific TIA are consistent with the impacts identified in the 2013 Program EIR. There are no new impacts identified. Furthermore, the project would be consistent with the mitigation framework established in the Program EIR through fair-share contribution to the PFFP improvement. See Table 6 below.

Table 6 Summary Table					
Impact	Mitigation	Significance of Impacts After Mitigation			
Impact TRF-1: Direct impact at the intersection Caliente Avenue at the SR-905 westbound (WB) ramp (LOS E PM)	TRF-1: Prior to issuance of the first building permit, owner/permittee shall restripe the southbound approach to include a through lane, a through-right turn lane, and right turn lane satisfactory to the City Engineer and Caltrans.	Impacts would be reduced to less than significant.			
Impact TRF-2: Direct impact at the intersection of Caliente Avenue at Airway Road (LOS F AM)	TRF-2: Prior to issuance of the first building permit, owner/permittee shall assure by permit and bond the installation of a traffic signal satisfactory to the City Engineer if said signal is not already installed and operational	Impacts would be reduced to less than significant.			
Impact TRF-3: Direct impact at the intersection of Otay Mesa Road at Emerald Crest Ct (LOS F PM)	TRF-3: Prior to issuance of the first building permit, owner/permittee shall assure by permit and bond the installation of a traffic signal satisfactory to the City Engineer if said signal is not already installed and operational.	Impacts would be reduced to less than significant.			
Impact TRF-4: Direct Opening Day 2020 impact at the intersection Caliente Avenue at the SR-905 westbound (WB) ramp (LOS E PM)	TRF-1: Prior to issuance of the first building permit, owner/permittee shall restripe the southbound approach to include a through lane, a through-right turn lane, and right turn lane satisfactory to the City Engineer and Caltrans.	Impacts would be reduced to less than significant.			
Impact TRF-5 Direct Opening Day 2020 impact at the intersection of Caliente Avenue at Airway Road (LOS F AM)	TRF-2: Prior to issuance of the first building permit, owner/permittee shall assure by permit and bond the installation of a traffic signal satisfactory to the City Engineer if said signal is not already installed and operational	Impacts would be reduced to less than significant.			
Table 6 Summary Table					
---	--	--	--		
Impact	Mitigation	Significance of Impacts After Mitigation			
Impact TRF-6: Direct Opening Day 2020 impact at the intersection of Otay Mesa Road at Emerald Crest Ct (LOS F PM)	TRF-3: Prior to issuance of the first building permit, owner/permittee shall assure by permit and bond the installation of a traffic signal satisfactory to the City Engineer if said signal is not already installed and operational.	Impacts would be reduced to less than significant.			
Impact TRF-7: Horizon Year 2062 cumulative impact at the intersection of Otay Mesa Rd/Ocean View Hills Pkwy/Caliente Ave (LOS E PM)	TRF-4: Prior to issuance of the first building permit, owner/permittee shall bond for the restriping of the westbound approach to three left turn lanes, a through-right turn lane, and an exclusive right turn lane satisfactory to the City Engineer.	With implementation of the mitigation measure, impacts would be reduced to less than significant. However, if not implemented in the Horizon Year, then the impact would not be mitigated consistent with the 2013 Program EIR.			
Impact TRF-8: Horizon Year 2062 cumulative impact at the intersection of Caliente Avenue/SR-905 WB Ramp (LOS F PM)	TRF-5: Prior to issuance of the first building permit, owner/permittee shall make a fair share contribution of 8.8% toward PFFP OM T-11.1 that includes the construction of an additional southbound right turn lane satisfactory to the City Engineer.	Implementation of this mitigation measure would reduce impacts to less than significant. However, if the PFFP is not fully funded by Horizon Year, then the impact would not be mitigated consistent with the 2013 Program EIR.			
Impact TRF-9: Horizon Year 2062 impact at the intersection of Caliente Avenue at Airway Road (LOS F AM & PM), Impact TRF-10: Horizon Year 2062 impact at the intersection of Otay Mesa Road at Emerald Crest Court (LOS F PM), and	TRF-6: The Horizon Year cumulative impacts at Caliente Avenue/Airway Road and Otay Mesa Road/Emerald Crest Court (Impacts TRF-9 and TRF-10) will be mitigated by TRF-2 and TRF-3 at project's Opening Day 2020.	Impact would be reduced to less than significant.			
Impact TRF-11: Horizon Year 2062 impact along the segment of Caliente Ave between Otay Mesa Rd and SR-905 WB Ramp (LOS F).	TRF-7: Prior to issuance of the first building permit, owner/permittee shall assure by permit and bond the construction of a full width raised median on Caliente Avenue from Otay Mesa Rd to SR-905 WB Ramp, satisfactory to the City Engineer. Improvements shall be installed and operational prior to first occupancy.	Impact would be reduced to less than significant.			

A Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, as detailed within Section VI of the Addendum, would be implemented to reduce impacts related to transportation/circulation to below a level of significance.

Based on the foregoing analysis and information, there is no evidence that the project would require a major change to the 2013 Program EIR. The project would not result in a new significant impact,

nor would a substantial increase in the severity of impacts from that described in the 2013 Program EIR occur.

#### **Public Services**

#### 2013 Program EIR

Section 5.13 of the 2013 Program EIR provides an analysis of public service impacts associated with the CPU. The 2013 Program EIR stated that buildout of the CPU would increase demand for fire protection services and would contribute to the need for new or altered facilities. The CPU anticipated construction of a planned 10,500-square-foot fire station (Fire Station No. 49) in addition to a 10,500-square-foot fire station to be collocated with the police facilities near Britannia Boulevard and Airway Road to ensure the department meets established response times, within the CPU area. The construction of new facilities would take place within the development footprint of the CPU and would be subject to separate environmental review at the time design plans are available. Therefore, at the program-level of analysis conducted for the 2013 Program EIR, impacts related to the construction of fire protection facilities were determined to be less than significant.

The 2013 Program EIR stated that buildout of the CPU would result in additional demand for police service in Beat 713. At discussed in the 2013 Program EIR, the average response times for Beat 713 exceed both the citywide average and police department goals for Emergency, Priority One, and Priority Two calls. Police response times would continue to increase with the buildout of CPU and the increase of traffic generated by new growth, requiring construction of new facilities. The 2013 Program EIR stated that construction of new facilities would take place within the development footprint of the CPU and would be subject to separate environmental review at the time design plans are available. Therefore, it was determined that, at the program level analysis, impacts related to the construction of new police protection facilities would be less than significant.

The 2013 Program EIR stated that buildout of the proposed CPU would place additional demands on school services and additional facilities would be required to meet the needs of the CPU buildout. As discussed in the 2013 Program EIR, the construction of these facilities would take place within the development footprint of the CPU and would be subject to separate environmental review at the time design plans are available. The 2013 Program EIR determined that payment of the statutory fee, pursuant to Senate Bill (SB) 50, by future projects consistent with CPU would mitigate the impact because of the provision that the statutory fees constitute full and complete mitigation. Impacts were determined to be less than significant.

The 2013 Program EIR identified that new parks would be required in the CPU area in order to meet the increased demand associated with buildout of the proposed CPU. Under the CPU, approximately 2,909 acres would be designated for parks and open space. Of this, 161 acres were designated for population-based parks. The remaining 2,748 acres would consist of open space. The construction of additional park facilities is specifically indicated in the PFFP for the CPU; and the 2013 Program EIR stated that it is reasonable to assume that these facilities would be constructed in the future. The construction of these facilities would take place within the development footprint of the CPU and would be subject to separate environmental review at the time design plans are available. Therefore, at this program-level of analysis, the 2013 Program EIR determined that impacts related to the construction of new park and recreation facilities within the CPU area would be less than significant.

The 2013 Program EIR stated that there would be a need for an additional library facility to serve the CPU area upon buildout. The 2013 Program EIR stated that the construction of a new facility was specifically contemplated by the current PFFP for the CPU, and that it is reasonable to assume that this facility would be constructed in the future. The construction of this facility would take place within the development footprint of the CPU and would be subject to separate environmental review at the time design plans are available. Therefore, the 2013 Program EIR determined that at the program level of analysis, impacts related to the construction of a new library within the CPU area would be less than significant.

#### Project

The project would result in additional residents to the site and within the CPU area, beyond that anticipated under the CPU. This would increase the demand for fire protection within the service area. However, the project would be constructed per applicable fire codes and comply with applicable City regulations, and would be located within the service area for the City's Fire-Rescue Department (SDFD). As the site was previously zoned for commercial development, the site would require to be serviced by the Fire-Rescue Department, regardless of the final land use of the site. Although, the project could result in increases in service calls due to development of a vacant site, and an increase in population beyond that anticipated by the CPU, no new facilities or improvements to existing facilities would be required as a result of the project. Furthermore, Development Impact Fees (DIFs) would be paid prior to building permit issuance, which would be used to maintain as well as fund future facilities. Therefore, no new or expanded facilities would be required as a result of the project, and impacts would be less than significant.

The project would introduce new residents at the project site, and result in an increase in population beyond that anticipated by the CPU. Although the project could result in increases in service calls, no new facilities or improvements to existing facilities would be required as a result of the project. As discussed in the 2013 Program EIR, the average response times for Beat 713 exceed the citywide average and department's goals for all calls, except Priority Four calls. As the site was previously zoned for commercial development under the CPU, the project site would be required to be serviced by SDPD, regardless of the final land use of the site. Therefore, development of residential units within the project site would not be anticipated to require the provision of ne police service facilities within the CPU area, as the need for police services at this site was previously contemplated under the 2013 Program EIR and CPU. Moreover, ongoing funding for police services is provided by the City General Fund, and DIFs would be paid prior to building permit issuance, which would be used to maintain as well as fund future facilities. Therefore, no new or expanded facilities would be required as a result of the project, and impacts would be less than significant.

The project would introduce new residents at the project site, and result in an increase in population beyond that anticipated by the CPU, as the site was previously designated and zoned for commercial use.

According to the 2013 Program EIR, the project site is within the Sweetwater Union High School District (SUHSD) and the San Ysidro School District (SYSD). Buildout of the CPU was anticipated to result in an additional 9,312 students within the SYSD, and 2,527 students within the SUHSD. The student generation rate utilized in the 2013 Program EIR for Multi-Family residential development (as proposed for the project) was 0.5424 per unit for SYSD and 0.1171 per unit for SUHSD. Based on

the potential buildout of 267 Multi-Family units, the project is anticipated to generate an additional 145 students within the SYSD and 32 students within the SUHSD, for a total of 177 students, beyond that anticipated by the 2013 Program EIR.

As discussed in the 2013 Program EIR, the individual school districts are responsible for planning, siting, building, and operating schools in their responsible districts within the CPU area. When additional demand warrants, the provision of school facilities would be the responsibility of the SYSD and SUHSD. SB 50 identifies the development fee and mitigation procedures for school facilities. SB 50 limits the mitigation that may be required to the scope of the review of any future project's impacts to schools, and the findings for school impacts. Payment of the statutory fees by the project would constitute full and complete mitigation. Thus, the payment of statutory fees to SYSD and SUHSD and adherence to the policies contained in the CPU would reduce impacts related to the provision of new educational facilities to less than significant. Therefore, impacts associated with the construction of future school facilities would be less than significant.

Relative to parks and recreation facilities, the General Plan standard for population-based parks is 2.8 useable acres per 1,000 residents, which can be achieved through a combination of neighborhood and community park acreages and park equivalencies. The most recent San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) household population estimates are as of March 2017 and include a household population of 17,658 residents in Otay Mesa (SANDAG 2017a). This existing population estimate requires about approximately 47.6 acres of population-based parks. According to the 2013 Program EIR, buildout of the CPU would result in a total of 161 acres of designated population-based parks, of which 51 acres were included as existing population-based park area in the northwest district of the CPU area, resulting in an adequacy of 3.4 acres of existing population-based park area.

The General Plan standard for population-based recreation facilities is one 17,000-square-foot Recreation Center for every 25,000 residents and one Aquatic Complex for every 50,000 residents. The most recent household population estimate of 17,658 within Otay Mesa does not reach these thresholds. There are currently no existing recreation centers and no existing aquatic complexes within the CPU area. Buildout of the CPU area is anticipated to reach 67,035 residents, requiring two 17,000-square-foot recreation centers and one aquatic complex of 50,000 square feet. There are no planned recreation centers or aquatic centers for the CPU at this time; however, Policy 7.1-15 of the CPU includes language to include both a recreation center and aquatic center in the Grand Park to equitably serve the Otay Mesa community.

Buildout of the project at 267 units would be anticipated to generate a population of an additional 983 residents, utilizing the SANDAG persons per household rate of 3.68 for Otay Mesa (SANDAG 2017a), which would require 2.75 acres of population-based park area, which would fall within the excess 3.4 acres of existing population-based park area within the CPU area. However, the additional population increase of the project would contribute to a deficiency of parks in the community at full buildout, as the population increase would require the provision of 2.75 acres of population-based park acres for the CPU area at full buildout. The park portion of the current per-unit DIFs to be paid at the time off building permit issuance provides for public facilities required to support the proposed population including the population-based park usable acreage, recreation centers, and aquatic complexes.

The increased demand placed on recreational facilities associated with the project is not considered substantial relative to the community as a whole, and the project alone would not require provision of additional park land or the construction of additional recreational facilities. The project would construct an on-site 0.19-acre on-site recreation park. This recreation park, though not satisfying population-based park requirements at full buildout of the CPU area, does provide recreational opportunities for the project's residents. The payment of park fees in accordance with the City's DIF schedule for new residential units would be required as a condition of project approval. Therefore, the project would have a less than significant impact on parks and recreational facilities.

Buildout of the project site at 267 units would be anticipated to generate 983 residents, utilizing the SANDAG persons per household rate of 3.68 for Otay Mesa (SANDAG 2017a). As discussed in the 2013 Program EIR, the existing Otay Mesa-Nestor Library serves the needs for both the Otay Mesa-Nestor and the Otay Mesa communities. In addition, the San Ysidro Library, located outside the CPU area, is also available for the residents of the Otay Mesa community. In addition, the CPU provides that a library facility would be provided within the community as the community is built out (Otay Mesa CPU, Public Facilities, Services and Safety Element Policy 6.6-4). Even with the population increase projected to be generated by the project, existing library systems would not be impaired, nor would additional or expanded library facilities be required. Because residents may use the central library or any branch library that is part of the San Diego Public Library system, the existing branches could adequately serve the increase in residents from the project and no new or altered facilities would be required. Furthermore, DIFs would be required prior to building permit issuance. Impacts would be less than significant.

Based on the foregoing analysis and information, there is no evidence that the project would require a major change to the 2013 Program EIR. The project would not result in a new significant impact, nor would a substantial increase in the severity of impacts from that described in the 2013 Program EIR occur.

Therefore, based on the foregoing analysis and information, there is no evidence that the project requires a major change to the EIR. The project would not create any new significant impact, nor would a substantial increase in the severity of impacts from that described in the EIR result.

#### **Public Utilities**

#### 2013 Program EIR

Section 5.14 of the 2013 Program EIR provides an analysis of utility system impacts associated with the CPU.

The 2013 Program EIR concluded that impacts associated with water and reclaimed water utility systems would be less than significant, as improvements to these systems had been previously identified in master planning documents, including Otay Water District's (OWD) 2008 WRMP and 2010 WRMP Update and the City's Public Utilities Department (PUD) Otay Mesa Master Plan Optimization Baseline Report, and would be required regardless of whether the CPU was implemented. As it pertains to wastewater utility systems, the 2013 Program EIR determined that impacts would be less than significant, as the 2004 Otay Mesa Trunk Sewer Master Plan and 2009 Refinement Report previously identified sewer system improvements as required in future phases to accommodate buildout wastewater generation from the area. The three additional improvements

identified within the CPU would occur within existing utility line easements and facilities and would not result in significant impacts to the environment.

Impacts associated with storm water infrastructure were concluded to be less than significant, as no storm drains, or other community-wide drainage facilities are proposed for construction in conjunction with adoption of the CPU. All such facilities would be constructed in conjunction with future development projects implemented in accordance with the CPU, designed to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. At the project-level, adherence to existing storm water regulations, conformance with General Plan and CPU policies, and review under CEQA would assure that impacts associated with the requirements for and/or construction of storm water infrastructure would be less than significant at the program-level.

Communication systems impacts were identified as less than significant, as cable and telephone services would be available through private utility companies that have capacity to serve the CPU area. In addition, the 2013 Program EIR determined that short-term construction impacts from installation of new communication systems or undergrounding for individual future projects under the CPU would not result in significant impacts because communication lines would be within existing or planned roadway right-of-way.

## Project

A site-specific Water Study and a Sewer System Analysis were prepared by Dexter Wilson Engineering, Inc. (DWE) (DWE 2018a and 2018b). The technical reports are summarized below.

The Water Study analyzed the existing public water system to determine whether the existing system is able to provide adequate domestic and fire protection service for the project, and to provide an analysis of the proposed water system for the project site. In calculating the potable water demand for the project, the Water Study utilized a demand factor of 450 gallons per day (gpd) per dwelling unit (DU) for multi-family residential development and 5,000 gpd per acre for commercial development. The project is anticipated to require 142,600 gpd, or 99 gallons per minute. As discussed in the Public Water Study, all on-site water lines would be private and would connect to the City's public water system via approved backflow preventers and meters at each end of the project boundary. The existing facilities are part of the Otay Mesa 680 Zone. There is an existing 24-inch public water line in Otay Mesa Road adjacent to the project site. The project would connect to this 24-inch line at the "east" cul-de-sac, where there is an existing stub in which the project water lines would connect to. The other private fire protection system connection would occur in Caliente Avenue along the western boundary of the project site. Two private domestic system connections would be made at this location, which would ensure looping within the City water system occurs.

The planning level multi-family fire flow guideline of 3,000 gallons per minute (gpm) was modeled at the multi-family residential area at several locations within the project site. The planning level commercial fire flow guideline of 4,000 gpm was modeled at both a designated node central within the commercial area and a proposed public hydrant adjacent to the commercial site.

The Water Study determined that under normal operating conditions, maximum day demand plus 3,000 gpm and 4,000 gpm fire flow scenarios can be met at the project site with all residual pressures greater than 45 pounds per square inch (psi) and 42 psi, respectively, and pipeline

velocities less than 15 feet per second (fps) under all-pipes-open scenarios as well as under pipe break scenarios.

The Sewer Study was conducted in order to determine whether the existing public gravity sewer system would be able to provide adequate capacity for the project. The project is anticipated to generate an average sewer flow of 90.475 gpd, or 62.8 gpm. The Sewer Study determined that public gravity sewer lines downstream from the project site lines would have adequate capacity to accommodate the wastewater generated by the project, and that no off-site gravity sewer improvements would be necessary. In addition to the off-site analysis, an on-site sewer analysis was completed utilizing the proposed manhole inverts throughout the project. The private on-site gravity sewer system would be designed according to the City's design standards. For all segments where velocities of 2 fps could not be achieved, there would be a minimum slope of 1 percent, which would allow for the depth ratios and velocities in the proposed on-site gravity sewer lines to comply with City design criteria.

Consistent with the 2013 Program EIR Mitigation Framework measure UTIL-1, a site-specific Waste Management Plan (WMP) was prepared for the project by RECON Environmental, Inc. (RECON 2018b). The WMP concluded that with implementation of the strategies outlined in this WMP and compliance with all applicable City ordinances, solid waste impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance regarding collection, diversion, and disposal of waste generated from construction and demolition, grading, and occupancy. The designation of a Solid Waste Management Coordinator during demolition, grading, and construction phases would achieve a 78 percent of waste diverted from landfill disposal. During occupancy, the applicant or applicant's successor in interest would be required to implement the ongoing measures detailed in the WMP to ensure maximum diversion from landfills. Compliance with the measures identified in the WMP would ensure solid waste impacts would be less than significant.

As discussed under the hydrology and water quality section above, the project would construct private on-site drainage systems with a series of downspouts, inlets, and pipes. Storm runoff would be conveyed by the private alleys and driveways to the on-site storm drain systems. The majority of the runoff would be conveyed towards the northeast corner of the site where the proposed on-site storm drain would connect to an existing storm drain in Otay Mesa Road about 500 feet east of the site. The existing storm drain outlets into a natural watercourse within Dennery Canyon on the north side of Otay Mesa Road. The watercourse continues north to the Otay River, which flows into San Diego Bay. Runoff from the northwest corner of the project site would be conveyed by the proposed streets and storm drain system to an existing storm drain system at the intersection of Caliente Avenue and Otay Mesa Road. Storm runoff from the westerly pad would also enter this storm drain system, before out letting into a natural watercourse within Dennery Canyon, continuing to the Otay River, which flows into San Diego Bay. Since the project is in the entitlement phase, detailed design of the storm drain system was not provided, and hydraulic analyses were not performed. Detention would be designed for the westerly flows as needed, during final engineering.

Similar to the conclusions made in the 2013 Program EIR, there would be no significant impacts to cable and telephone services, as these are available through private utility companies that have the capacity to serve the CPU area. In addition, the City administers an undergrounding program and short-term construction impacts from installation of new communication systems or undergrounding for individual future projects under the CPU would not result in significant impacts

because communication lines would be within existing or planned roadway right-of-way. As such, any communication utility lines constructed for the purpose of serving the project site would be less than significant, as these lines would be constructed within existing right-of-way. No significant impact is anticipated as a result of undergrounding these utility lines in order to provide communication systems to the project site.

Based on the foregoing analysis and information, there is no evidence that the project would require a major change to the 2013 Program EIR. The project would not result in a new significant impact, nor would a substantial increase in the severity of impacts from that described in the 2013 Program EIR occur.

#### Water Supply

#### 2013 Program EIR

Section 5.15 of the 2013 Program EIR provides an analysis of water supply impacts associated with the CPU. The 2013 Program EIR determined that impacts associated with water supply would be less than significant. The Water Supply Assessment (WSA) prepared for the 2013 Program EIR concluded that there is sufficient water supply to serve existing demands, project demands of the CPU, and future water demands within the City of San Diego PUD and OWD service area in normal and dry year forecasts during a 20-year projection.

The 2013 Program EIR concluded that impacts associated with landscape plans would be less than significant, as all future development must conform to existing regulations, as well as the General Plan and CPU policies, which would ensure the use of predominantly drought-resistant landscaping and water conservation for landscape maintenance.

#### Project

As discussed in the 2013 Program EIR WSA, future water supply within the City PUD and the OWD's service area would be sufficient to meet the projected water demands under buildout of the CPU, as well as existing and other reasonably foreseeable planned development projects within the OWD for a 20-year planning horizon, in normal and in single and multiple dry years. The WSA prepared for the 2013 Program EIR assessed water supply demands within the City PUD service area based on ultimate buildout of 9,255 multi-family units and 13,758 employees. Based on the water supply unit rate utilized in the 2013 WSA, multi-family development would use 80 gpd per person, while commercial development would utilize 1,785 gpd per acre or 60 gpd per employee. As discussed in the 2013 Program EIR, the projected water demand of the CPU with the City's PUD service area was estimated at 5,563 acre-feet per year (AFY). Per the City's 2010 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP), the planned water demand for the adopted Otay Mesa Community Plan was 5,393 AFY. The remaining portion of the estimated 170 AFY was accounted for through the Accelerated Forecast Growth demand increment of the San Diego County Water Authority (SDCWA) 2010 UWMP. Since the project would require a rezone and CPA to allow for residential development within land that has been designated as Community Commercial under the CPU, the project would add residential capacity within an area not previously identified for residential development. As such, the project would result in the construction of additional multi-family units beyond what is anticipated for the CPU area. The project would develop a maximum of 267 multi-family units to an area zoned for commercial use, while reducing the overall commercial acreage to that could be developed within the project site to 4.5 acres. Buildout of the 167 multi-family residential units would be anticipated

to use approximately 57,031 gpd (based on 2.67 persons per household (SANDAG 2017b) and 8,032 gpd in order to serve the commercial uses, based on the water use rates utilized in the WSA. If the project site were to be constructed entirely with commercial uses, the anticipated water usage would be 26,061 gpd. Thus, the project would result in an increased use of approximately 30,970 gpd over what would be utilized under the current land use and zoning designations.

However, as discussed in the 2015 City of San Diego PUD UWMP, San Diego County Water Authority's 2015 UWMP long-range water demand forecast incorporates a small demand increment associated with potential accelerated forecasted growth (AFG). This demand increment is intended to account for land use development included in SANDAG's growth forecast and projected to occur beyond year 2040, but not yet accounted for in local jurisdictions' land use plans.

The AFG demand increment was included in the SDCWA's 2015 UWMP to assist member agencies with general plan amendments that rely on the SDCWA's demand forecast to comply with laws linking water availability and land-use approvals, and intended to ensure SDCWA is adequately planning supplies for potential growth within the service area during the 2015 UWMP planning horizon. As a member agency of SDCWA, the City has access to SDCWA's regional supply associated with AFG, in conjunction with supplies identified in the City's 2015 UWMP. As was concluded in the 2013 Program EIR, the CPU would not result in a shortage of water supply within the portion of the CPU area that would be served by City of San Diego PUD, because the City would rely on purchases from the SDCWA in order to ensure all water supply needs are met. In regard to the project, the City of San Diego PUD would have access to SDCWA's regional supply associated with AFG, thereby ensuring the anticipated population increase associated with the project would have adequate water supply. Additionally, the residential component of the project would be required to implement a number of water conservation features required by City including CAP checklist requirements for water efficient buildings such as requiring installation low-flow fixtures, Thus, impacts would be less than significant.

The project would include a landscape plan that would provide for a landscaping theme that consists of a natural, drought-tolerant character that compliments the architecture of the development and areas for recreation activities. Canopy trees would be used to soften architectural edges. The MAWA for the project is calculated to be 1,249,000 gallons/year. All landscape and irrigation within the project site would conform to the requirements of the City's Land Development Code Landscape Standards (2009) and the applicable sections of the SDMC Chapter 14, Article 2, Division 4: Landscape Regulations, thereby ensuring impacts would be less than significant.

Based on the foregoing analysis and information, there is no evidence that the project would require a major change to the 2013 Program EIR. The project would not result in a new significant impact, nor would a substantial increase in the severity of impacts from that described in the 2013 Program EIR occur.

#### **Population and Housing**

#### 2013 Program EIR

Section 5.16 of the 2013 Program EIR provides an analysis of population and housing impacts associated with the CPU. The 2013 Program EIR determined that impacts associated with population growth would be less than significant, as the CPU would implement SANDAG's Regional

Comprehensive Plan (RCP) and Regional Housing Element and the City's General Plan and Housing Element by providing a mix of housing types within mixed-use centers linked to public transportation, increase the City's and region's supply of needed housing consistent with SANDAG's regional growth forecast, and focus increased housing supply within compact villages conducive to supporting frequent transit service in accordance with the RCP and General Plan goals and policies. The CPU provides comprehensive planning for the management of population growth and necessary economic expansion to support economic development efforts where none currently exist, resulting in a less than significant impact.

The 2013 Program EIR determined that impacts associated with affordable housing would be less than significant, as the land use designations and design guidelines contained in the CPU are intended to foster the development of housing for all income levels. As such, the CPU would provide affordable housing units consistent with federal and state regulations and the City's objective of increasing the stock of affordable housing impacts to affordable housing, resulting in a less than significant impact.

## Project

The project would require a CPA and a rezone to allow for residential development within land that has been designated as Community Commercial-Residential Prohibited under the CPU. Therefore, the project would add residential capacity within an area not previously identified for residential development. However, the project would not induce substantial population growth beyond what was analyzed in the 2013 Program EIR. The CPU Program EIR estimated that population buildout under the CPU would increase to approximately 67,035 people by 2050. The total population for the CPU area in 2017 was estimated to be 17,658 (SANDAG 2017). Utilizing a person per household rate of 3.68, as provided by SANDAG 2017 estimates, the project is anticipated to generate approximately 983 residents. The addition of 983 people would not result in a significant increase in population growth within the area, and would be consistent with the projected increase in overall population expected for the Otay Mesa community planning area. Impacts would be less than significant.

The project would incorporate at least 10 percent of the total units developed as affordable housing units within the residential development, thereby complying with the requirements of the City's Inclusionary Affordable Housing Regulations (LDC Section 142.1300) and General Plan and CPU policies. Under the current 171-unit VTM and site plan, 18 affordable units are proposed; however, should the maximum 267 units be developed, at least 27 affordable housing units would be provided to meet the 10 percent requirement. Impacts would be less than significant.

In addition, the project would serve to implement SANDAG'S RCP and Regional Housing Element, as well as work to implement the goals of the City's General Plan and Housing Element by providing a mix of housing types within mixed-use centers linked to public transportation. The project would increase the City's and region's supply of needed housing consistent with SANDAG's regional growth forecast. In addition, the project would focus increased housing supply within compact villages conducive to supporting frequent transit service in accordance with the RCP and General Plan goals and policies.

Based on the foregoing analysis and information, there is no evidence that the project would require a major change to the 2013 Program EIR. The project would not result in a new significant impact,

nor would a substantial increase in the severity of impacts from that described in the 2013 Program EIR occur.

#### **Agricultural and Mineral Resources**

#### 2013 Program EIR

Section 5.17 of the 2013 Program EIR provides an analysis of agricultural and mineral resource impacts associated with the CPU. The 2013 Program EIR determined that impacts associated with the conversion of agricultural land would be less than significant. It was determined that although the CPU would convert additional Important Farmland to non-agricultural uses, these areas are fragmented and are surrounded by urban land uses and MHPA lands, and agricultural viability within the CPU area has been significantly reduced due to rising land values, water costs, increasing taxes, habitat management planning, and other land use conflicts. Agricultural land in the CPU area is intended as an interim, rather than permanent use. The CPU allows agriculture as an interim use pending development and would rezone the Central Village to an agricultural "holding" zone to accommodate continued agricultural operations until such time that a Specific Plan is implemented.

The 2013 Program EIR determined that impacts associated with City and regional consequences of agricultural land conversion would be less than significant, as the viability of this area for agricultural use is limited, and the amount of existing farmland is minimal relative to the regional total.

The 2013 Program EIR determined that impacts to mineral resources would be less than significant, as portions of the CPU area where Mineral Resource Zone (MRZ)-2 "regionally significant" aggregate resource areas exist are currently developed or where entitlements have already been approved for future development. These existing and planned developments restrict access to these aggregate areas and preclude the ability to extract those resources. Further, the majority of the acreage designated as MRZ-2 contains existing residential uses, which would be incompatible with extraction operations even under the adopted community plan. MRZ-3 mineral resources are not considered a significant mineral resource. As such, the ability to extract mineral resources would not be impacted with the adoption of the CPU.

#### Project

The project site is located on land that is designated as Farmland of Local Importance, as shown on Figure 5.17-1 of the 2013 Program EIR. However, the project site is not currently in active agricultural use, is fragmented and surrounded by other urban land uses and freeway corridor and has been previously designated for commercial development under the approved land use plan for the Otay Mesa CPU. In addition, the project site is not currently designated or zoned for agricultural production. Therefore, impacts related to the conversion of agricultural land would be less than significant.

In addition, the project site is located within a MRZ-3 as shown on Figure 5.17-3 of the 2013 Program EIR, which is land that is not considered to be significant mineral resource areas. Impacts to mineral resources would not occur.

Based on the foregoing analysis and information, there is no evidence that the project would require a major change to the 2013 Program EIR. The project would not result in a new significant impact, nor would a substantial increase in the severity of impacts from that described in the 2013 Program EIR occur.

## **Greenhouse Gas Emissions**

#### 2013 Program EIR

The CPU Program EIR determined that impacts associated with GHG emissions and consistency with adopted plans, policies, and regulations would be significant and unmitigated at the program level as if future projects could potentially not meet the necessary reduction goals even with implementation of Mitigation Framework GHG-1. The CPU contains policies that would reduce GHG emissions from transportation and operational building uses and would be consistent with the strategies of local and state plans, policies, and regulations aimed at reducing GHG emissions from land use and development. Subsequent projects implemented in accordance with the CPU would be required to implement GHG-reducing features beyond those mandated under existing codes and regulations.

The 2013 Program EIR identified Mitigation Framework measure GHG-2 requiring future projects to demonstrate their avoidance of significant impacts related to long-term operational emissions. However, even with implementation of mitigation, impacts would remain significant and unmitigated as the analysis determined that the 9.1 to 11.4 percent reductions relative to business as usual (BAU) would fall short of meeting the City's goal of a minimum 28.3 percent reduction in GHG emissions relative to BAU. While the Mobility, Urban Design, and Conservation elements of the CPU included specific policies that work to minimize GHG emissions, such as requiring dense and compact development, encouraging efficient energy and water conservation design, and increasing transit accessibility, among others, the CPU's projected emissions would fall short of meeting the 28.3 percent reduction goal.

## Project

In the time following the certification of the CPU Program EIR, the City adopted a Climate Action Plan (CAP) in December 2015 that outlines the actions the City will undertake to achieve its proportional share of State GHG emission reductions. The City has identified the following five CAP strategies to reduce GHG: energy- and water-efficient buildings; clean and renewable energy; bicycling, walking, transit, and land use; zero waste (gas and waste management); and climate resiliency. In order to ensure that future developments comply with the CAP, the City adopted a CAP Consistency Checklist, adopted July 12, 2016, which is the primary document used by the City to ensure a project-by-project consistency with the underlying assumptions in the CAP and thereby to ensure the City will achieve the emission reduction targets identified in its CAP.

The CPU Program EIR Identified various policies and recommendations aimed to reduce GHG emissions of which support the City's reduction goals. Therefore, in keeping with the policies in the CPUs, the project would be required to comply with the CAP Consistency Checklist.

**CAP Consistency Checklist**. The CAP Consistency Checklist includes a three-step process to determine if a project would result in a GHG impact. Step 1 consists of an evaluation to determine the project's consistency with existing General Plan, Community Plan, and zoning designations for the site. Step 2 consists of an evaluation of the project's consistency with applicable strategies and actions of the CAP. Step 3 is to determine whether a project with a land use and/or zone

designation change within a Transit Priority Area (TPA) would be consistent with the assumptions of the CAP. Step 3 would only apply if Step 2 is answered in the affirmative under Option B. The project's consistency with the CAP Consistency Checklist is presented below.

Under Step 1 of the CAP Consistency Checklist Step (Land Use Consistency), the project would require a CPA to change the land use designation of the project site from Community Commercial – Residential Prohibited to Residential Medium Density and a rezone within a portion of the site from CC-1-3 to RM-3-7 within a TPA, thus triggering the requirement to conduct a CAP Checklist Step 3 conformance evaluation. Additionally, emissions due to operation of the residential and retail uses were calculated by RECON (RECON 2018c). It was found that the project would be less GHG-intensive when compared to the existing designations, as the project would result in the annual emission of 5,182 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (MT CO<sub>2</sub>E) in comparison to 10,311 MT CO<sub>2</sub>E if the site were to be built out entirely as a commercial use. The project would be consistent with the growth projections used in the development of the CAP per Step 1(A) for the residential component and Step 1(B) for the residential component.

Completion of Step 2 of the CAP Consistency Checklist demonstrates that the project would be consistent with applicable strategies and action for reducing GHG emissions. This includes project features consistent with the energy and water efficient buildings strategy, as well as bicycling, walking, transit, and land use strategy. These project features would be assured as a condition of project approval. Thus, the project is consistent with the CAP.

As required by Step 3 of the CAP Consistency Checklist, the project would implement the City of Villages strategy in an identified TPA by providing housing in a mixed-use setting within 1,500 feet walking distance of a transit stop and allow for community-serving commercial uses. In addition, the project would support identified public transit routes and include transit priority measures, as the project would add density directly adjacent to an existing bus route (Route 905) and within 1,500 feet walking distance of a park-and-ride lot and would include a TDM plan to foster use of alternative forms of transportation other than single occupancy vehicles.

In regard to pedestrian improvements, the project proposes internal private pedestrian connections shaded by canopy trees and would install new non-contiguous sidewalks along the project frontage along Otay Mesa Road and Caliente Avenue. Thus, the project incorporates features for walkability, providing direct access to the transit stop and to local commercial amenities. Pertaining to increasing bicycle opportunities, the project would provide adequate frontage along Otay Mesa Road to allow for implementation of planned bicycle improvements but would not install bike lane striping since this would need to be coordinated and implemented along the length of the roadway, which is beyond the control of the project applicant. Coordination with adjacent properties would occur to the best of the applicant's ability. Additionally, the project would include 12 short-term and 12 long-term bicycle parking spaces, in compliance with the requirements for commercial development under Step 2 of the CAP Checklist.

The project would include the construction of a 0.19-acre park to provide recreational opportunities for future residents, up to 45,000 square feet of commercial uses that would provide additional employment opportunities and would enhance the surrounding right-of-way by providing improved pedestrian pathways adjacent to and within the project site. The project would also include landscaping improvements within the project site and along the project site frontage that would

enhance the roadway corridor and the pedestrian realm along Otay Mesa Road. The project would construct a non-contiguous sidewalk along the project frontage with Otay Mesa Road, and include street trees along the sidewalk area, thereby creating a more comfortable walking environment through shading and separation from vehicles. In addition, the project site's location in proximity to an existing bus route, park and ride facility, and existing and proposed Class I, II, and III bicycle routes would encourage alternative transportation uses. The project landscape plan provides for a number of tree options to accommodate the varying needs throughout the project site and frontage consistent with policies identified related to Urban Forest Management Plan. The three primary goals and objectives of the Urban Forestry Management Plan are to increase the City's urban tree canopy cover and maximize the benefits of trees, maximize the efficiencies in maintaining the benefits of trees, and to minimize the risk of trees in an urban environment. The project proposes to include 295 canopy trees ranging from 15 to 65 feet in height, as well as 450 evergreen shrubs. Provision of these trees would help to reduce greenhouse gas emissions associated with the project site and the surrounding area, and help to remove many pollutants from the atmosphere, including nitrogen dioxide, sulfur dioxide, ozone, carbon monoxide, and particulate matter. The provision of these trees, pursuant to the requirements of the City Land Development Code Landscape Standards, would increase the overall tree canopy within the City and minimize the risk associated with trees in an urban environment, and the project site and would be irrigated to ensure the sustained lifespan of the trees, ensuring their benefits are maximized. As such, the project would comply with Step 3 of the CAP checklist.

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

Based on the foregoing analysis and information, there is no evidence that the project would require a major change to the 2013 Program EIR. The project would not result in a new significant impact, nor would a substantial increase in the severity of impacts from that described in the 2013 Program EIR occur.

## VI. ISSUES NOT ANALYZED IN THE PREVIOUS EIR

CEQA Guidelines, Section 15128, allows environmental issues for which there is no likelihood of a significant impact to not be discussed in detail or analyzed further in the EIR. The certified Program EIR provided a similar level of analysis, even for those issue areas considered to result in impacts found not to be significant.

Revisions to the project components evaluated under the 2013 Program EIR are proposed with the current project. Through the environmental analysis conducted, the City has determined that the current project, subject of and evaluated under this Addendum would not have the potential to cause significant impacts to those issue areas beyond those analyzed. While these issues were not analyzed in detail, as outlined in CEQA Section 15128, there is no new information available that would indicate that these issues would result in new significant impacts.

## VII. MITIGATION, MONITORING, AND REPORTING PROGRAM (MMRP) INCORPORATED INTO THE PROJECT

The project shall be required to comply with the applicable mitigation measures outlined within the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) of the previously certified Program EIR (No. 30330/304032/SCH No. 2004651076) and those identified with the project-specific subsequent technical studies. The following MMRP identifies measures that specifically apply to this project.

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

- 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.
- 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: http://www.sandiego.gov/development-services/industry/standtemp.shtml
- 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)

 PRECONSTRUCTION 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 Acoustical Monitor, 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) No. 605191 and/or Environmental Document No. 605191, 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: *Not Applicable*
- 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:

Issue Area	Document Submittal	Associated Inspection/Approvals/Notes
General	Consultant Qualification Letters	Prior to Preconstruction Meeting
General	Consultant Construction Monitoring Exhibits	Prior to or at Preconstruction Meeting
Biology	Consultant Qualification Letters	Prior to Preconstruction Meeting
Biology	Biology Reports	Biology/Habitat Restoration Inspection
Paleontology	Paleontology Reports	Paleontology Site Observation
Archaeology	Archaeology Reports	Archaeology/Historic Site Observation
Noise	Acoustical Reports	Noise Mitigation Features Inspection
Traffic	Traffic Reports	Traffic Features Site Observation
Paleontological Resources	Paleontology Reports	Paleontology Site Observation
Waste Management	Waste Management Reports	Waste Management Inspections
Bond Release	Request for Bond Release Letter	Final MMRP Inspections Prior to Bond Release Letter

#### **Document Submittal/Inspection Checklist**

## C. SPECIFIC MMRP ISSUE AREA CONDITIONS/REQUIREMENTS

## <u>Biological Resources (Burrowing Owl)</u> <u>PRECONSTRUCTION SURVEY ELEMENT</u> - Prior to Permit or Notice to Proceed Issuance:

- As this project has been determined to be BUOW occupied or to have BUOW occupation potential, the Applicant Department or Permit Holder shall submit evidence to the ADD of Entitlements verifying that a Biologist possessing qualifications pursuant "Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation, State of California Natural Resources Agency Department of Fish and Game. March 7, 2012 (hereafter referred as CDFG 2012, Staff Report), has been retained to implement a burrowing owl construction impact avoidance program.
- 2. The qualified BUOW biologist (or their designated biological representative) shall attend the pre-construction meeting to inform construction personnel about the City's BUOW requirements and subsequent survey schedule.

## **Prior to Start of Construction:**

1. The Applicant Department or Permit Holder and Qualified Biologist must ensure that initial pre-construction/take avoidance surveys of the project "site" are completed between 14 and

30 days before initial construction activities, including brushing, clearing, grubbing, or grading of the project site; regardless of the time of the year. "Site" means the project site and the area within a radius of 450 feet of the project site. The report shall be submitted and approved by the Wildlife Agencies and/or City MSCP staff prior to construction or BUOW eviction(s) and shall include maps of the project site and BUOW locations on aerial photos.

- 2. The pre-construction survey shall follow the methods described in CDFG 2012, Staff Report Appendix D (*please note, in 2013, CDFG became California Department of Fish and Wildlife or CDFW*).
- 3. 24 hours prior to commencement of ground disturbing activities, the Qualified Biologist shall verify results of preconstruction/take avoidance surveys. Verification shall be provided to the City's Mitigation Monitoring and Coordination (MMC) Section. If results of the preconstruction surveys have changed and BUOW are present in areas not previously identified, immediate notification to the City and WA's shall be provided prior to ground disturbing activities.

## **During Construction:**

- Best Management Practices shall be employed as BUOWs are known to use open pipes, culverts, excavated holes, and other burrow-like structures at construction sites. Legally permitted active construction projects which are BUOW occupied and have followed all protocol in this mitigation section, or sites within 450 feet of occupied BUOW areas, should undertake measures to discourage BUOWs from recolonizing previously occupied areas or colonizing new portions of the site. Such measures include, but are not limited to, ensuring that the ends of all pipes and culverts are covered when they are not being worked on, and covering rubble piles, dirt piles, ditches, and berms.
- 2 Ongoing BUOW Detection If BUOWs or active burrows are not detected during the preconstruction surveys, Section "A" below shall be followed. If BUOWs or burrows are detected during the pre-construction surveys, Section "B" shall be followed. NEITHER THE MSCP SUBAREA PLAN NOR THIS MITIGATION SECTION ALLOWS FOR ANY BUOWS TO BE INJURED OR KILLED OUTSIDE OR WITHIN THE MHPA; in addition, IMPACTS TO BUOWs WITHIN THE MHPA MUST BE AVOIDED.
  - A. Post Survey Follow Up if Burrowing Owls and/or Signs of Active Natural or Artificial Burrows Are Not Detected During the Initial Pre-Construction Survey Monitoring the site for new burrows is required using CDFW Staff Report 2012 Appendix D methods for the period following the initial pre-construction survey, until construction is scheduled to be complete and is complete (NOTE Using a projected completion date (that is amended if needed) will allow development of a monitoring schedule).
    - If no active burrows are found but BUOWs are observed to occasionally (1-3 sightings) use the site for roosting or foraging, they should be allowed to do so with no changes in the construction or construction schedule.
    - 2) If no active burrows are found but BUOWs are observed during follow up monitoring to repeatedly (4 or more sightings) use the site for roosting or foraging, the City's Mitigation Monitoring and Coordination (MMC) Section shall be notified and any portion of the site where owls have been sites and that has not been graded or otherwise disturbed shall be avoided until further notice.

- 3) If a BUOW begins using a burrow on the site at any time after the initial preconstruction survey, procedures described in Section B must be followed.
- 4) Any actions other than these require the approval of the City and the Wildlife Agencies.
- **B.** Post Survey Follow Up if Burrowing Owls and/or Active Natural or Artificial Burrows are detected during the Initial Pre-Construction Survey - Monitoring the site for new burrows is required using Appendix D CDFG 2012, Staff Report for the period following the **initial** pre-construction survey, until construction is scheduled to be complete and is complete (*NOTE* - Using a projected completion date (that is amended if needed) will allow development of a monitoring schedule which adheres to the required number of surveys in the detection protocol).
  - This section (B) applies only to sites (including biologically defined territory) wholly outside of the MHPA – all direct and indirect impacts to BUOWs within the MHPA <u>SHALL</u> be avoided.
  - 2) If one or more BUOWs are using any burrows (including pipes, culverts, debris piles etc.) on or within 300 feet of the proposed construction area, the City's MMC Section shall be contacted. The City's MMC Section shall contact the Wildlife Agencies regarding eviction/collapsing burrows and enlist appropriate City biologist for on-going coordination with the Wildlife Agencies and the qualified consulting BUOW biologist. No construction shall occur within 300 feet of an active burrow without written concurrence from the Wildlife Agencies. This distance may increase or decrease, depending on the burrow's location in relation to the site's topography, and other physical and biological characteristics.
    - a) Outside the Breeding Season If the BUOW is using a burrow on site outside the breeding season (i.e. September 1 – January 31), the BUOW may be evicted after the qualified BUOW biologist has determined via fiber optic camera or other appropriate device, that no eggs, young, or adults are in the burrow and written concurrence from the Wildlife Agencies for eviction is obtained prior to implementation.
    - b) During Breeding Season If a BUOW is using a burrow on-site during the breeding season (Feb 1-Aug 31), construction shall not occur within 300 feet of the burrow until the young have fledged and are no longer dependent on the burrow, at which time the BUOWs can be evicted. Eviction requires written concurrence from the Wildlife Agencies prior to implementation.
  - 3) Survey Reporting During Construction Details of construction surveys and evictions (if applicable) carried out shall be immediately (within 5 working days or sooner) reported to the City's MMC Section and the Wildlife Agencies and must be provided in writing (as by e-mail) and acknowledged to have been received by the required Agencies and DSD Staff member(s).

## **Post Construction**:

 Details of the all surveys and actions undertaken on-site with respect to BUOWs (i.e., occupation, eviction, locations etc.) shall be reported to the City's MMC Section and the Wildlife Agencies within 21 days post-construction and prior to the release of any grading bonds. This report must include summaries off all previous reports for the site; and maps of the project site and BUOW locations on aerial photos.

### **Historical Resources**

**HR-1** Due to the potential for buried cultural resources to be encountered on-site, a qualified archaeological monitor and a Native American monitor shall be present during project-related grading activities. This shall include removal of existing pavement and concrete hardscaping such as walkways. The following measures shall be implemented:

## I. Prior to Permit Issuance or Bid Opening/Bid Award

- A. Entitlements Plan Check
  - Prior to permit issuance or Bid Opening/Bid Award, 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. Prior to Bid Award, 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 (quartermile 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 inhouse, 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
  - 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. Acknowledgement of Responsibility for Curation (CIP or Other Public Projects) The applicant shall submit a letter to MMC acknowledging their responsibility for the cost of curation associated with all phases of the archaeological monitoring program.
- 3. Identify Areas to be Monitored
  - a. Prior to the start of any work that requires monitoring, the PI shall submit an Archaeological Monitoring Exhibit (AME) (with verification that the AME has been reviewed and approved by the Native American consultant/monitor when Native American resources may be impacted) based on the appropriate construction documents (reduced to 11x17) to MMC identifying the areas to be monitored including the delineation of grading/excavation limits.
  - b. The AME shall be based on the results of a site-specific records search as well as information regarding the age of existing pipelines, laterals and associated appurtenances and/or any known soil conditions (native or formation).
  - c. MMC shall notify the PI that the AME has been approved.
- 4. 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 conditions such as age of existing pipe to be replaced, depth of excavation and/or site graded to bedrock, etc., which may reduce or increase the potential for resources to be present.
- 5. Approval of AME and Construction Schedule After approval of the AME by MMC, the PI shall submit to MMC written authorization of the AME and Construction Schedule from the CM.

#### III. During Construction

- A. Monitor 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.
  - The Native American consultant/monitor shall determine the extent of their presence during soil disturbing and grading/excavation/trenching activities based on the AME and provide that information to the PI and MMC. If prehistoric resources are encountered during the Native American consultant/monitor's absence, work shall stop and the Discovery Notification Process detailed in Section III.B-C and IV.A-D shall commence.

- 3. The PI may submit a detailed letter to MMC during construction requesting a modification to the monitoring program when a field condition such as modern disturbance post-dating the previous grading/trenching activities, presence of fossil formations, or when native soils are encountered that may reduce or increase the potential for resources to be present.
- 4. The archaeological and Native American consultant/monitor shall document field activity via the Consultant Site Visit Record (CSVR). The CSVR's shall be faxed 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
  - 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 Bl, 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) and obtain written approval of the program from MMC, CM and RE. ADRP and any mitigation must be approved by MMC, RE and/or CM 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 Section 15064.5, 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.
      - (1) Note: For pipeline trenching and other linear projects in the public Right-of-Way, the PI shall implement the Discovery Process for Pipeline Trenching projects identified below under "D."
    - 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.
      - (1) Note: For Pipeline Trenching and other linear projects in the public Rightof-Way, if the deposit is limited in size, both in length and depth; the

information value is limited and is not associated with any other resource; and there are no unique features/artifacts associated with the deposit, the discovery should be considered not significant.

- (2) Note, for Pipeline Trenching and other linear projects in the public Right-of-Way, if significance cannot be determined, the Final Monitoring Report and Site Record (DPR Form 523A/B) shall identify the discovery as Potentially Significant.
- D. Discovery Process for Significant Resources Pipeline Trenching and other Linear Projects in the Public Right-of-Way

The following procedure constitutes adequate mitigation of a significant discovery encountered during pipeline trenching activities or for other linear project types within the Public Right-of-Way including but not limited to excavation for jacking pits, receiving pits, laterals, and manholes\_to reduce impacts to below a level of significance:

- 1. Procedures for documentation, curation and reporting
  - a. One hundred percent of the artifacts within the trench alignment and width shall be documented in-situ, to include photographic records, plan view of the trench and profiles of side walls, recovered, photographed after cleaning and analyzed and curated. The remainder of the deposit within the limits of excavation (trench walls) shall be left intact.
  - b. The PI shall prepare a Draft Monitoring Report and submit to MMC via the RE as indicated in Section VI-A.
  - c. The PI shall be responsible for recording (on the appropriate State of California Department of Park and Recreation forms-DPR 523 A/B) the resource(s) encountered during the Archaeological Monitoring Program in accordance with the City's Historical Resources Guidelines. The DPR forms shall be submitted to the South Coastal Information Center for either a Primary Record or SDI Number and included in the Final Monitoring Report.
  - d. The Final Monitoring Report shall include a recommendation for monitoring of any future work in the vicinity of the resource.

## 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 provenience of the remains.

- 2. The Medical Examiner, in consultation with the PI, will determine the need for a field examination to determine the provenience.
- 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 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.

d. Upon the discovery of multiple Native American human remains during a ground disturbing land development activity, the landowner may agree that additional conferral with descendants is necessary to consider culturally appropriate treatment of multiple Native American human remains. Culturally appropriate treatment of such a discovery may be ascertained from review of the site utilizing cultural and archaeological standards. Where the parties are unable to agree on the appropriate treatment measures the human remains and items associated and buried with Native American human remains shall be reinterred with appropriate dignity, pursuant to Section 5.c., above.

- D. If Human Remains are NOT Native American
  - 1. The PI shall contact the Medical Examiner and notify them of the historic era context of the burial.
  - 2. The Medical Examiner will determine the appropriate course of action with the PI and City staff (PRC 5097.98).
  - 3. If the remains are of historic origin, they shall be appropriately removed and conveyed to the San Diego Museum of Man for analysis. The decision for internment of the human remains shall be made in consultation with MMC, EAS, the applicant/landowner, any known descendant group, and the San Diego Museum of Man.

## 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 the RE and 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. 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 via the RE 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 as a result of 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 or Pipeline Trenching Discovery Process 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 via the RE for revision or, for preparation of the Final Report.
- 3. The PI shall submit revised Draft Monitoring Report to MMC via the RE 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.
- 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. 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 C.
  - 3. The PI shall submit the Accession Agreement and catalogue record(s) to the RE or BI, as appropriate for donor signature with a copy submitted to MMC.
  - 4. The RE or BI, as appropriate shall obtain signature on the Accession Agreement and shall return to PI with copy submitted to MMC.
  - 5. The PI shall include the Acceptance Verification from the curation institution in the Final Monitoring Report submitted to the RE or BI and MMC.
- 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 of the approved report.

2. The RE shall, in no case, issue the Notice of Completion until receiving a copy of the approved Final Monitoring Report from MMC which includes the Acceptance Verification from the curation institution.

#### **Paleontological Resources**

- I. Prior to Permit Issuance
  - A. Entitlements Plan Check
    - 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 Paleontological Monitoring have been noted on the appropriate construction documents.
  - B. Letters of Qualification have been submitted to ADD
    - 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 paleontological monitoring program, as defined in the City of San Diego Paleontology Guidelines.
    - 2) MMC will provide a letter to the applicant confirming the qualifications of the PI and all persons involved in the paleontological monitoring of the project.
    - 3) Prior to the start of work, the applicant shall obtain approval from MMC for any personnel changes associated with the monitoring program.
- II. Prior to Start of Construction
  - A. Verification of Records Search
    - The PI shall provide verification to MMC that a site-specific records search has been completed. Verification includes, but is not limited to a copy of a confirmation letter from San Diego Natural History Museum, other institution or, if the search was inhouse, 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.
  - B. PI Shall Attend Precon Meetings
    - Prior to beginning any work that requires monitoring; the Applicant shall arrange a Precon Meeting that shall include the PI, Construction Manager (CM) and/or Grading Contractor, Resident Engineer (RE), Building Inspector (BI), if appropriate, and MMC. The qualified paleontologist shall attend any grading/excavation related Precon Meetings to make comments and/or suggestions concerning the Paleontological Monitoring program with the Construction Manager and/or Grading Contractor.
      - 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 a Paleontological Monitoring Exhibit (PME) based on the appropriate construction documents (reduced to 11 x 17 inches) to MMC identifying the areas to be monitored including the delineation of grading/excavation limits. The PME shall be based on the results of a site-specific records search as well as information regarding existing known soil conditions (native or formation).
- 3) When Monitoring Will Occur
  - 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 conditions such as depth of excavation and/or site graded to bedrock, presence or absence of fossil resources, etc., which may reduce or increase the potential for resources to be present.

## III. During Construction

- A. Monitor Shall be Present During Grading/Excavation/Trenching
  - The monitor shall be present full-time during grading/excavation/trenching activities as identified on the PME that could result in impacts to formations with high and moderate resource sensitivity. The Construction Manager is responsible for notifying the RE, PI, and 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 PME.
  - 2) The PI may submit a detailed letter to MMC during construction requesting a modification to the monitoring program when a field condition such as trenching activities that do not encounter formational soils as previously assumed, and/or when unique/unusual fossils are encountered, which may reduce or increase the potential for resources to be present.
  - 3) The monitor shall document field activity via the Consultant Site Visit Record (CSVR). The CSVRs 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 Paleontological Monitor shall direct the contractor to temporarily divert trenching activities in the area of discovery and immediately notify the RE or BI, as appropriate.
  - 2) The Monitor shall immediately notify the PI (unless Monitor is the PI) of the discovery.
  - 3) The PI shall immediately notify 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.

- C. Determination of Significance
  - 1) The PI shall evaluate the significance of the resource.
    - 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. The determination of significance for fossil discoveries shall be at the discretion of the PI.
    - b) If the resource is significant, the PI shall submit a Paleontological Recovery Program (PRP) and obtain written approval from MMC. Impacts to significant resources must be mitigated before ground disturbing activities in the area of discovery will be allowed to resume.
    - c) If resource is not significant (e.g., small pieces of broken common shell fragments or other scattered common fossils) the PI shall notify the RE, or BI as appropriate, that a non-significant discovery has been made. The Paleontologist shall continue to monitor the area without notification to MMC unless a significant resource is encountered.
    - d) The PI shall submit a letter to MMC indicating that fossil resources will be collected, curated, and documented in the Final Monitoring Report. The letter shall also indicate that no further work is required.
- IV. 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 8 a.m. on the next business day.
      - b) Discoveries All discoveries shall be processed and documented using the existing procedures detailed in Sections III During Construction.
      - c) Potentially Significant Discoveries If the PI determines that a potentially significant discovery has been made, the procedures detailed under Section III -During Construction shall be followed.
      - d) The PI shall immediately contact MMC, or by 8 a.m. on 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 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.

- V. Post Construction
  - A. Preparation and Submittal of Draft Monitoring Report
    - The PI shall submit two copies of the Draft Monitoring Report (even if negative), prepared in accordance with the Paleontological Guidelines which describes the results, analysis, and conclusions of all phases of the Paleontological Monitoring Program (with appropriate graphics) to MMC for review and approval within 90 days following the completion of monitoring,
      - a) For significant paleontological resources encountered during monitoring, the Paleontological Recovery Program shall be included in the Draft Monitoring Report.
      - b) Recording Sites with the San Diego Natural History Museum

The PI shall be responsible for recording (on the appropriate forms) any significant or potentially significant fossil resources encountered during the Paleontological Monitoring Program in accordance with the City's Paleontological Guidelines, and submittal of such forms to the San Diego Natural History Museum with the Final Monitoring Report.

- 2) 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 Fossil Remains
  - 1) The PI shall be responsible for ensuring that all fossil remains collected are cleaned and catalogued.
  - 2) The PI shall be responsible for ensuring that all fossil remains are analyzed to identify function and chronology as they relate to the geologic history of the area; that faunal material is identified as to species; and that specialty studies are completed, as appropriate
- C. Curation of fossil remains: Deed of Gift and Acceptance Verification
  - 1) The PI shall be responsible for ensuring that all fossil remains associated with the monitoring for this project are permanently curated with an appropriate institution.
  - 2) The PI shall include the Acceptance Verification from the curation institution in the Final Monitoring Report submitted to the RE or BI and MMC.
- D. Final Monitoring Report(s)
  - 1) The PI shall submit two copies of the Final Monitoring Report to MMC (even if negative), within 90 days after notification from MMC that the draft report has been approved.

 The RE shall, in no case, issue the Notice of Completion until receiving a copy of the approved Final Monitoring Report from MMC which includes the Acceptance Verification from the curation institution.

#### **Transportation/Circulation**

The project is calculated to have three direct and Near Term cumulative significant impacts, and five Horizon Year cumulative impacts to project area intersections and road segments. The project would require the following mitigation measures:

- **TRF-1:** To mitigate the direct impact at Caliente Ave/SR-905 WB ramp (Impacts TRF-1 and TRF-4), prior to issuance of the first building permit, Owner/Permittee shall restripe the southbound approach to include a through lane, a through-right turn lane, and right turn lane satisfactory to the City Engineer and Caltrans.
- **TRF-2:** To mitigate the direct impact at Caliente Avenue/ Airway Road (Impacts TRF-2 and TRF-5), prior to issuance of the first building permit, Owner/Permittee shall assure by permit and bond the installation of a traffic signal satisfactory to the City Engineer if said signal is not already installed and operational.
- **TRF-3:** To mitigate the direct impact at Otay Mesa Road/Emerald Crest Court (Impacts TRF-3 and 6), prior to issuance of the first building permit, Owner/Permittee shall assure by permit and bond the installation of a traffic signal satisfactory to the City Engineer if said signal is not already installed and operational.
- **TRF-4:** To mitigate the Horizon Year cumulative impact at Otay Mesa Road/Ocean View Hills/Caliente Avenue intersection (Impact TRF-7), prior to issuance of the first building permit, Owner/Permitee shall bond for the restriping of the westbound approach to three left turn lanes, a through-right turn lane, and an exclusive right turn lane satisfactory to the City Engineer.
- **TRF-5:** To mitigate the Horizon Year cumulative impacts at Caliente Avenue/SR-905 WB Ramp (Impact TRF-8), prior to issuance of the first building permit), the Owner/Permitee shall make a fair share contribution of 8.8 percent toward PFFP OM T-11.1 towards the construction of an additional southbound right turn lane at the intersection of Caliente Avenue/SR-905 West Bound ramp satisfactory to the City Engineer.
- **TRF-6**: The Horizon Year cumulative impacts at Caliente Avenue/Airway Road and Otay Mesa Road/ Emerald Crest Court (Impacts TRF-9 and TRF-10), will be mitigated by TRF-3 at project's Opening Day 2020.
- **TRF-7:** To mitigate the Horizon Year cumulative impact along the roadway segment of Caliente Avenue from Otay Mesa Road to SR-905 WB Ramp (Impact TRF-11), prior to issuance of the first building permit, the Owner/Permitee shall assure by permit and bond the construction of a full-width City Standard raised median on Caliente Avenue from Otay Mesa Road to SR-905 WB Ramp, satisfactory to the City Engineer. Improvements shall be installed and operational prior to first occupancy.

#### VIII. SIGNIFICANT UNMITIGATED IMPACTS

The 2013 Program EIR indicated that significant impacts to the following issue areas would be substantially lessened or avoided if all the proposed mitigation measures recommended in the 2013 Program EIR were implemented: land use; biological resources; historical resources; human health/public safety/hazardous materials; hydrology/water quality; geology/soils; and paleontological resources. The 2013 Program EIR further concluded that significant impacts related to air quality, noise, utilities, and greenhouse gas emissions would not be fully mitigated to below a level of significance. With respect to cumulative impacts, implementation of the 2013 Program EIR would result in significant impacts related to air quality, noise, traffic/circulation (horizon year), utilities (solid waste), agriculture resources, and greenhouse has emissions, which would remain significant and unmitigated. Because there were significant unmitigated impacts associated with the original project approval, the decision maker was required to make specific and substantiated "CEQA Findings" which stated: (a) specific economic, social, or other considerations which make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the 2013 Program EIR, and (b) the impacts have been found acceptable because of specific overriding considerations. Given that there are no new or more severe significant impacts that were not already addressed in the previous certified Program EIR, new CEQA Findings and or Statement of Overriding Considerations are not required.

The project would not result in any additional significant impacts nor would it result in an increase in the severity of impacts from that described in the previously certified Program EIR.

## IX. CERTIFICATION

Copies of the addendum, the 2013 Program EIR, the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, and associated project-specific technical appendices, if any, may be reviewed by appointment in the office of the Development Services Department, or purchased for the cost of reproduction.

E. Shearer-Nguyen, Senior Planner Development Services Department

Attachments:

Figure 1: Regional Location Figure 2: Project Site on USGS Map Figure 3: Aerial Photograph Figure 4: Site Plan Figure 5: VTM Figure 6: Adopted California Terraces Precise Plan March 18, 2019 Date of Final Report

#### X. REFERENCES

#### Chang Consultants

2018a Preliminary Drainage Report for California Terraces – PA 61. October.

2018b Priority Development Project Storm Water Quality Management Plan, California Terraces – PA 61. September.

#### Department of Toxic Substances Control

2018 EnviroStor Database. https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/. Accessed October 10, 2018.

#### Dexter Wilson Engineering, Inc.

2018a Water Study for the California Terraces Planning Area 61 Project. September.

2018b Sewer Service Analysis for the California Terraces Planning Area 61 Project. October.

#### GEOCON, Inc.

2018 Update Geotechnical Investigation, Oceanview Hills – PA 61. March.

#### LOS Engineering, Inc.

2019 Transportation Impact Analysis, California Terraces PA 61 – January 14.

#### Placeworks

2019 California Terraces - PA61 Master Planned Development Permit #2192984.

#### **RECON Environmental, Inc.**

- 2018a Western Burrowing Owl Non- Breeding Survey Results at the PA-61 Project Survey Area. July.
- 2018b Waste Management Plan for the Shops at AMC Promenade. September.
- 2018c Climate Action Plan Consistency Checklist, California Terraces Planning Area 61.
- 2019a Air Quality Analysis for the California Terraces Planning Area 61 Project. February.
- 2019b Noise Analysis for the California Terraces Planning Area 61 Project. February.

#### San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG)

- 2017a Demographic and Socio Economic Estimates, Otay Mesa Community Planning Area. http://datasurfer.sandag.org/download/sandag\_estimate\_2016\_cpa\_otay-mesa.pdf. Accessed January 17, 2019.
- 2017b Demographic and Socio Economic Estimates. San Diego. http://datasurfer.sandag.org/download/sandag\_estimate\_2016\_jurisdiction\_san-diego.pdf. Accessed January 21, 2019.

#### State Water Resources Control Board

2018 GeoTracker Database. http://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/. Accessed October 10, 2018.





## **Regional Location**

<u>California Terraces - PA 61/Project No. 60519</u>1 City of San Diego – Development Services Department

FIGURE No. 1





Project Location on USGS Map

<u>California Terraces - PA 61/Project No. 60519</u>1 City of San Diego – Development Services Department

FIGURE No. 2





**Project Location on Aerial Photograph** <u>California Terraces - PA 61/Project No. 60519</u>1 City of San Diego – Development Services Department

FIGURE No. 3
#### Map Source: CivilSense, Inc.





## Site Plan

<u>California Terraces - PA 61/Project No. 605191</u> City of San Diego - Development Services Department

# FIGURE No. 4

Map Source: CivilSense, Inc.





#### **Project Grading and Utility Plan**

California Terraces - PA 61/Project No. 605191

City of San Diego - Development Services Department

## FIGURE No. 5

Map Source: City of San Diego





### **Adopted California Terraces Precise Plan**

California Terraces - PA 61/Project No. 605191

City of San Diego - Development Services Department

L LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL LM LOW-MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL HIGH-MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL COMMERCIAL С JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL JR ELEMENTARY SCHOOL NEIGHBORHOOD PARK NP CP COMMUNITY PARK OS OPEN SPACE

м

нм

E

**BRBB PRECISE PLAN BOUNDARY** D PLANNING AREA NUMBER

Project Area

FIGURE **No.** 6