

# ADDENDUM

THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO

Project No. 660043 Addendum to EIR No. 89-0702/SCH No. 89071907 SEIR No. 89-0928/SCH No. 89071907 and MND Nos. 6655 and 5844

SUBJECT: One Alexandria Square: A request for a SITE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT (SDP) to amend SDP No. 9829 and SDP No. 151106, COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT (CDP) to amend CDP No. 9828 and CDP No. 10911, NEIGHBORHOOD DEVELOPMENT PERMIT (NDP) No. 2474613 and a TENTATIVE MAP (TM) to allow for development of a ten-building research and development (R&D) campus with supporting and ancillary uses, surface parking lots, subterranean parking, and a parking structure. The project proposes to demolish two existing buildings, improve/upgrade two existing buildings, and construct eight new buildings and a parking structure.<sup>1</sup> All parking will be provided onsite. The total project gross floor area (GFA) at build-out would be 428,160 square feet (SF). Supporting site improvements, including grading, onsite connections to sewer and water, drainage system improvements, landscaping and irrigation, and hardscape are also proposed. Through the NDP, the project would request allowable deviations from applicable development regulations with respect to setbacks and driveway widths. The site is designated Industrial Employment (IE) and zoned Industrial Park IP-1-1 zone within the Torrey Pines Subarea of the University Community Plan (UCP). Additionally, the project is also located within Community Plan Implementation Overlay Zone Type B (CPIOZ B), Transit Priority Area (TPA), Airport Environs Overlay (AEOZ), Marine Corps Air Station (MCAS) Miramar - Airport Land Use Compatibility Overlay (ALUCOZ), Coastal Overlay Zone (COZ)(Non-appealable [N-APP]), Coastal Height Limit Overlay (CHLOZ), and Parking Impact Overlay (PIOZ). Assessor's Parcel Numbers: 340-010-34, 340-012-01, 340-012-02, 340-012-03, 340-012-04, 340-012-05). Applicant: Alexandria Real Estate.

### I. Summary of Original Projects

The 22.3-acre project site lies within the boundaries of an approximately 16-acre project area previously analyzed in the 1989 Calbiochem Community Plan Amendment Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and 1993 Calbiochem-Balit U.S. Holding Supplemental EIR (SCH No.: 89071907) and the 2005 Alexandria Technology Center – Science Park Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) 6655. The portion of the project located on the remaining 6.22 acres of the project site was addressed in the 2005 Torrey Pines Science Park MND 5844. Through these existing entitlements and prior environmental documents, 428,169 SF of industrial park uses, and an estimated 1,242 employees

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The project includes the complete demolition of the existing two buildings located at 10931-10933 and 10975 North Torrey Pines Road.

are currently allowed within the combined 22.3-acre project site. The projects analyzed in these prior environmental documents are described in further detail below.

# 1989 Calbiochem Community Plan Amendment EIR No. 89-0702 (SCH No. 89071907)

The 1989 Calbiochem Community Plan Amendment EIR No. 89-0702 (SCH No.: 89071907) analyzed a Community Plan Amendment that would increase the allowed development intensity for scientific research use on 16.08-acres of the project site from 7,585 SF per acre to 20,000 SF per acre. Maximum development was 285,600 SF of scientific research use. Other discretionary actions that were anticipated but not analyzed, included a Planned Industrial Permit (PID) and CDP. The impact analysis assumed development of the entire 16.08-acre project site by expanding existing facilities and constructing new facilities, parking areas and landscaping. It assumed selective demolishing of structures and 100,000 cubic yards (CY) of cut and 20,000 CY of fill, exporting 80,000 CY offsite.

Impacts were identified relative to Traffic, Air Quality, Hydrology, Land Use and Safety, Biological Resources, Hazardous Materials, and Visual Quality. Mitigation measures were not presented in the 1989 EIR because there was no mechanism assumed available at that time to assure implementation of a mitigation monitoring and reporting program. Therefore, all environmental issue areas analyzed, with the exception of Hazardous Materials, were considered significant unmitigable impacts. Findings and a Statement of Overriding Considerations were made for the significant unmitigable impacts.

# 1993 Calbiochem-Balit U.S. Holding Supplemental EIR No. 89-0928 (SCH No. 89071907)

A 1993 Supplemental EIR (SEIR) No. 89-0928 updated the 1989 EIR to account for revisions to the project related to the discretionary review of the PID and CDP related to the proposed 285,600 SF of scientific research use through a Local Coastal Program (LCP) Amendment. The project analyzed included substantial revisions to reduce potential impacts to Biological Resources and Cultural Resources, resulting in the inclusion of an open space easement over approximately 1.5 acres of land in the northeasterly portion of the site. Though the PID and CDP process, mitigation was also proposed for Traffic, Biological Resources, Hydrology, and Cultural Resources. Like the 1989 project, the 1993 SEIR assumed selective demolition of existing structures, remodeling of some structures, and construction of new structures. The new onsite facilities assumed a two-story administration building, two new laboratories, a cafeteria/library complex, a three-level structured parking garage, and a service/storage yard. Off-site improvements assumed widening Science Park Road to four lanes.

# 2005 Alexandria Technology Center - Science Park Mitigated Negative Declaration No. 6655

The MND 6655 analyzed a proposed Tentative Parcel Map, SDP, Planned Development Permit (PDP) and CDP to amend the PID and CDP assumed in the 1993 SEIR. The MND assumed a five-parcel subdivision of approximately 16 acres of land; four of the parcels were already developed or designated for development and the fifth parcel designated the 1.5-acre open space preserve. The MND analyzed demolition of the existing 40,000 SF administration building and construction of a new 68,701 SF building with an underground parking garage. The project assumed 18,500 CY of cut and 2,300 CY of fill with about 16,200 CY of exported soil. The net new square footage was within the 285,600 SF previously entitled through the project analyzed in the 1993 SEIR.

### 2005 Torrey Pines Science Park MND No. 5844

The 2005 MND 5844 addressed SDP 9829 and CDP 9828 on the 6.22 acre 10996 Torreyana Road project site. This project assumed demolishing an existing surface parking lot and constructing a 60,674 SF two-story R&D building and subsurface parking garage to serve the new building and an existing 81,895-SF building to be retained, for a total entitled square footage of 142,569 SF of industrial park use on the 6.22-acre site. The project assumed grading of four acres, with approximately 82,000 CY of cut and 2,000 CY of fill, resulting in 80,000 CY being exported. Grading and construction of the project required the removal of numerous non-sensitive, non-native trees.

# II. Project Description

The project requests a SDP to amend SDP No. 9829 and SDP No. 151106, a CDP to amend CDP No. 9828 and CDP No. 10911, an NDP No. 2474613 requesting deviations from development regulations, and a TM to allow for development of a ten-building research and development (R&D) campus with supporting and ancillary uses, surface parking lots, subterranean parking, and a parking structure. Specifically, the project entails the reconfiguration and expansion of the existing site to add R&D office/lab space (including underground parking), a parking structure, and an amenity village that would include accessory supporting uses such as food and beverage and retail. The proposed uses are expected to generate approximately 1,250 employees onsite.

The project proposes to retain two of the existing four buildings and some parking areas, while redeveloping the remainder of the site (Figure 1, *Site Plan*). Specifically, the two buildings at the western portion of the site, located at 10931/10933 North Torrey Pines Road and 10975 North Torrey Pines Road, would be demolished. The two remaining buildings located on the eastern portion of the site would be retained and are labeled as buildings B1 and B2. The project proposes to construct eight additional buildings and one parking garage. Three of the proposed buildings (buildings B3, B4, and B5) would also include subterranean parking. The square footages of the two buildings that will be retained, the eight proposed buildings, the proposed parking garage, and the total combined subterranean parking space for the three new buildings are shown in Table 1, *Project Summary*.

Building	Use	Total Building GFA (SF)	Parking Provided
B1 (Existing)	R&D	67,266	49 (In-Building) 138 (surface)
B2 (Existing)	R&D	75,720	68 (In-Building) 15 (surface)
B3 (New)	R&D	85,865	60 (In-Building)
B4 (New)	R&D	78,311	65 (In-Building)
B5 (New)	R&D	68,456	23 (In-Building)
B6 (New)	R&D	37,042	- real of hards from a
B7 (New)	R&D Amenity Village	3,017	- Manager and Angel
B8 (New)	R&D Amenity Village	2,473	
B9 (New)	R&D Amenity Village	2,735	
B10 (New)	R&D Amenity Village	7,275	-

### Table 1 PROJECT SUMMARY

Building	Use	Total Building GFA (SF)	Parking Provided
Central Utility Plant	Central Utility Plant Yard Maintenance		
Lot A	Surface Parking	-	101 (surface)
P-1 (New)	Parking Structure		968 (In-Building)
Total		428,160	1,487

In total, the project would retain 142,986 SF in existing building space and would construct 285,174 SF of building space totaling 428,160 GFA of building space. A 261,547 SF parking garage, and 110,518 SF of new subterranean parking space will also be constructed. The square footage of parking areas does not count toward the total building GFA. Buildings B1 and B2 would continue to support existing uses, including R&D uses in both buildings in addition to retail and restaurant space in B1. Buildings B3, B4, B5, and B6 would be constructed to support R&D uses. Buildings B7, B8, B9, and B10 would serve as the amenity village, consisting of retail and restaurant uses.

### Pre-Construction Activities

Prior to initiation of the project's construction activities, site preparation would require clearing/ grubbing and demolition. Clearing and grubbing would require removal of approximately 1,686 CY of existing vegetation. Two of the site's existing structures, specifically the buildings in the northeast corner and southeast corner, would remain. Three existing parking lots would be preserved as well, located at buildings B1, B2, and in Lot A. All of the other existing structures within the project area would be demolished, including the remaining buildings, paved parking lot areas, and sidewalks, curbs, and gutters. Approximately 147,458 SF of building material would be demolished and approximately 200,680 SF of asphalt material would be removed.

### Grading and Construction Activities

Grading on the project site is anticipated to require 183,150 CY of cut and 5,200 CY of fill. Therefore, a net 177,950 CY would be exported off site. Project grading and construction are expected to take approximately 14 months to complete.

### **Circulation and Access**

The following circulation system improvements are proposed in the vicinity of the project site:

### Driveways

Eight existing driveways currently serve the site. Two driveways are provided on North Torrey Pines Road, three driveways on Science Park Road, two driveways on Torreyana Road, and one driveway on Callan Road. The project would remove the two existing driveways on North Torrey Pines Road and construct a new driveway on North Torrey Pines Road that would serve as one of the project's two primary entrances (the second primary entrance will be on Science Park Road). The project would also improve the existing driveways to current standards per City of San Diego Standard Drawings for Public Works Construction.<sup>2</sup> Full access would be provided at all seven driveways except for the new primary entrance driveway located on North Torrey Pines Road, which would be restricted to right-in/right-out access only.

### Roadways

The project would restripe Science Park Road from 300 feet east of North Torrey Pines Road to Torreyana Road to provide a continuous two-way left-turn lane. This improvement would require removing the existing on-street parking along Science Park Road and would also include proposed buffered Class II bike lanes. In addition, the project would stripe a 75-foot left-turn lane on the eastbound approach of the Science Park Road-Merryfield Row/Torreyana Road intersection.

### Pedestrian

The project would construct non-contiguous sidewalks along portions of the project frontage on the east side of North Torrey Pines Road and along portions of the project frontage on the north side of Science Park Road. The project would also install a striped crosswalk across and signage at the northbound off-ramp at the North Torrey Pines Road/Callan Road interchange at the location where pedestrian curb ramps with truncated domes are currently provided. These improvements are recommended to improve pedestrian connectivity between the project site and the existing transit bus stop located on northbound North Torrey Pines Road approximately 300 feet north of Callan Road.

### Bicycle

Onsite, the project proposes to construct a separated bicycle facility along one side of the internal private drive that extends from Driveway 1 at North Torrey Pines Road to Driveway 3 at Science Park Road. Additionally, the project provides for a total of 106 bicycle parking spaces, exceeding the requirements found in the San Diego Municipal Code (SDMC). The bike parking is located in B3, B4 and B5 basements. Other short-term parking would be distributed in non-portable bike corrals located across the landscape/walkways and near the other buildings B6, B7, B8 and at P1.

Offsite, the project will restripe Science Park Road from North Torrey Pines Road to Torreyana Road to provide a buffered Class II bike lane in the eastbound direction and restripe Science Park Road from Torreyana Road to 300 feet east of North Torrey Pines Road to provide a buffered Class II bike lane in the westbound direction. In addition, install bicycle "sharrow" pavement markings along Torreyana Road and Callan Road in both directions of travel to provide a circuitous bicycle route around the One Alexandria Square project site.

### Transit

The project will coordinate with Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) to provide the following amenities for the existing transit bus stops located within a quarter-mile walking distance of the project site:

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> The City of San Diego Standard Drawings for Public Works Construction is updated every three years. The most recent version was published in 2019. The project would comply with the version that is currently published at the time of approval of final site design.

- Route 985: Provide a bus shelter, bench, and a trash receptable for the transit bus stop located along northbound North Torrey Pines Road approximately 100 feet north of Science Park Road and a bench and trash receptable for the transit bus stop located along northbound North Torrey Pines Road approximately 300 feet north of Callan Road.
- Route 978: Provide route signage and benches for the four existing transit bus stops located along Science Park Road (one stop), Torreyana Road (two stops), and Callan Road (one stop).

### **Utilities**

Because the project has been entitled and planned for 428,160 SF of building area, the existing utilities have adequate capacity to serve the project. The project will tie into existing utilities, including water mains and sewer laterals. Post-project runoff will be treated via a network of stormwater management features designed pursuant to the City of San Diego Storm Water Standards and the project's Storm Water Quality Management Plan (SWQMP).

### Proposed Deviations

The proposed development is requesting the following deviations from the SDMC and the UCP Community Plan Implementation Overlay Zone (CPIOZ) B, which will be processed through the NDP.

- 1. A deviation from SDMC Section 131.0631, Table 131-06C, for the required rear setback within the IP-1-1 zone. A 25-foot front setback is required, while a setback of 15-feet is provided.
- A deviation from the UCP CPIOZ-B for the required setback from North Torrey Pines Road. A 50-foot setback is required, while a variable setback ranging from 25-feet to 50-feet is provided.
- 3. A deviation from SDMC Section 142.0560 (J) 1, Table 142-05M for the maximum driveway width permitted. A 25-foot-wide driveway is the maximum permitted, while a 30-foot wide driveway is proposed.

# III. Environmental Setting

The 22.3-acre project site is located at 10933 North Torrey Pines Road (Assessor's Parcel Numbers [APNs]: 340-012-01-00, 340-012-02-00, 340-012-03-00, 340-012-04-00, 340-012-05-00, 340-010-34-00) in the UCP area.

The site has frontages on Callan Road, Torreyana Road, Science Park Road and North Torrey Pines Road and can be accessed from all four of these streets, with two entrances on North Torrey Pines Road. The site is located south of Torrey Pines Preserve, east of the Pacific Ocean, and west of Interstate (I)-5, within the current Alexandria Tech Center property (Figure 2, *Aerial Photograph*). Surrounding land uses include a restaurant and industrial uses to the north, hotels, restaurants, a spa, and the Torrey Pines Golf Course to the west, and medical laboratories and research centers to the east and south. There are currently four buildings on the site for research and development, office, and other supporting uses. These uses are served by existing public services and utilities. The project site is generally flat and with an elevation ranging from 350 to 435 above mean sea level (AMSL). The site is located within the Coastal Zone and within the boundary of the City's Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) Subarea Plan but is located outside of the Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA) (Figure 3, *Regional Context*). Two vegetation communities/land cover types were mapped within the project site: southern maritime chaparral and developed land. Two special status plant species were observed in the project site during the general biological survey and rare plant surveys: wart-stemmed ceanothus (*Ceanothus verrucosus*) and Torrey pine (*Pinus torreyana* ssp. *torreyana*). No special status animal species were detected in project site during biological surveys. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)-designated critical habitat does not occur within or near the proposed project.

Archaeological site P-37-012581 (i.e., a significant cultural resource) under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the City's historic resources guidelines and regulations occurs within a portion of the project site that is not currently developed. This site is also recommended as eligible for designation by the City's Historical Resources Board. No evidence of human remains or associated grave goods was found during any recent fieldwork. No built environment historic resources are present on-site.

A 1.5-acre open space parcel (APN 340-012-05) vegetated with native vegetation occurs within the north-central portion of the site. This open space parcel was established to preserve the historical resource site and offset significant biological impacts to sensitive vegetation and special status species. The current topography and vegetation within the open space parcel appear to have been planted as part of the site's original commercial development.

The site is zoned IP-1-1 and is within the CPIOZ B, TPA, AEOZ, MCAS Miramar – ALUCOZ, N-APP-1, CHLOZ, and PIOZ. The project site is currently entitled to 428,169 SF of Industrial Park uses under separate development permits, including (i) SDP No. 151106, PDP No. 10903 and CDP No. 10911 (approved in 2005), and (ii) SDP No. 9829 and CDP No. 9828 (approved in 2006). These original entitlements for the site and allowable development intensity were approved under the old (pre-2008) Marine Corps Air Station (MCAS) Miramar Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP). A substantial conformance review was approved for the combined site in 2014.

### IV. Environmental Determination

The City previously prepared and certified SEIR No. 89-0928 (SCH No. 89071907) per Resolution No. R-281847 on April 27, 1993 and approved MND Nos. 5844 and 6655 ("prior environmental documents"). Based on all available information and in light of the entire record, the analysis in this Addendum, and pursuant to Section 15762 and 15164 of the State CEQA Guidelines the City has determined the following:

- 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, 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 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 prior environmental documents are incorporated by reference herein pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15150. Public review of this Addendum is not required per CEQA.

### V. Impact Analysis

This Addendum includes the environmental issues analyzed in detail in the previously certified 1993 SEIR (which updated the 1989 EIR) and approved MND Nos. 5844 and 6655 as well as provides project-specific environmental analysis pursuant to the CEQA. The analysis in this document evaluates the adequacy of the prior environmental documents relative to project impacts and documents that the proposed project modifications and/or refinements would not cause new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the prior environmental documents.

The 1993 SEIR updated and supplemented the 1989 EIR analysis to include mitigation measures and a mitigation monitoring and reporting program. The revised project analyzed in the 1993 SEIR resulted in reduced impacts to Biological Resources and Cultural Resources; however, significant unmitigable impacts to Land Use and Safety, Traffic, Air Quality and Hydrology remained with the 1993 SEIR. The 1993 SEIR found no significant impacts related to Geology/Soils, Noise, Light/Glare/Shading, Natural Resources, Recreational Resources, Population, Housing, Public

Services, Utilities, Energy, or Water Conservation. For a summary comparison of impacts, see Table 2, *Impact Assessment Summary*.

Environmental Issues	1993 EIR	2005 MND 6655	2005 MND 5844	Project	New Mitigation?	Project Resultant Impact
Aesthetics/	Less than	Less than	No impact	No new	No	Less than
Visual Quality	significant	significant	and the star size of	impacts	Mark Sec. 1994	significant
Natural Resources (Agricultural Resources and Minerals)	No Significant Adverse Impact	No impact	No impact	No new impacts	No	No impact
Air Quality	Significant unmitigable	Less than significant	No impact	No new impacts	No	Less than significant
Biological Resources	Significant, but mitigated	No impact	Significant, but mitigated	No new impacts	Yes	Significant, but mitigated
Energy	No Significant Adverse Impact	No impact	No impact	No new impacts	No	Less than significant
Geology/Soils	No Significant Adverse Impact	Less than significant	No impact	No new impacts	No	010 500
Historic Resources (Archaeological)	Significant, but mitigated	Significant, but mitigated	Significant, but mitigated	No new impacts	Yes	Less than significant
Human Health/ Public Safety/ Hazardous Materials	Less than significant with mitigation	No impact	No impact	No new impacts	No	Less than significant
Hydrology/ Water Quality	Significant unmitigable	Less than significant	Less than significant	No new impacts	No	Less than significant
Land Use (and Safety)	Significant unmitigable	No impact	No impact	No new impacts	No	Less than significant
Noise	NA/NA	No impact	No impact	No new impacts	No	Less than significant
Paleontological Resources	NA/NA	No impact	Significant, but mitigated	No new impacts	No	Less than significant
Population and Housing	No Significant Adverse Impact	No impact	No impact	No new impacts	No	No impact
Public Services	No Significant Adverse Impact	No impact	No impact	No new impacts	No	Less than significant
Recreational Resources	No Significant Adverse Impact	No impact	No impact	No new impacts	No	Less than significant
Transportation/ Circulation	Significant unmitigable	No impact	No impact	No new impacts	No	Less than significant

Table 2 IMPACT ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

Environmental Issues	1993 EIR	2005 MND 6655	2005 MND 5844	Project	New Mitigation?	Project Resultant Impact
Utilities	No Significant	No impact	No impact	No new	No	Less than
	Adverse Impact			impacts		significant
Water	No Significant	No impact	No impact	No new	No	Less than
Conservation	Adverse Impact			impacts		significant

The 2005 Alexandria Technology Center – Science Park Mitigated Negative Declaration 6655 identified significant but mitigated impacts to Historical Resources (Archaeology). MND 6655 identified less than significant impacts or no significant impacts to Aesthetics, Agricultural Resources, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Energy, Geology/Soils, Human Health/Public Safety/ Hazardous Materials, or Hydrology/Water Quality, Land Use, Noise, Paleontological Resources, Population and Housing, Public Services, Recreational Resources, Transportation/Circulation, Utilities, Water Conservation.

The 2005 Torrey Pines Science Park MND 5844 found significant but mitigated impacts to Biology, Historical Resources (Archaeology), and Paleontology. MND 5844 found less than significant impacts to Water Quality. All other issue areas were found to have no impact.

# Land Use (and Safety)

### 1993 EIR

The Land Use and Safety analysis within the 1993 SEIR found that the project would not be consistent with land use and environmental goals of the UCP and that significant unmitigated impacts related to air quality and traffic conflicted with the UCP, resulting in a significant unmitigated impact. The project was found to be consistent with the LCP in the 1993 SEIR.

### 2005 MND 6655

The 2005 MND 6655 found that the proposed uses were consistent with the UCP and MCAS Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP). No other land use impacts were identified.

### 2005 MND 5844

The 2005 MND 5844 found that the proposed uses were consistent with the UCP and MCAS ALUCP. The project site is located outside of the MHPA. No other land use impacts were identified.

### **Proposed Project**

Implementation of the project would occur within the same parcels evaluated in the prior environmental documents. The project consists of construction of 428,160 GFA of R&D and associated land uses, which would not divide the existing community as the project site is currently occupied with similar land uses.

The site is zoned Industrial - IP-1-1 and is within the UCP CPIOZ B, TPA, AEOZ, MCAS Miramar - ALUCOZ, COZ - N-APP-1, CHLOZ, and CPIOZ. The IP-1-1 zoning allows for R&D uses with some limited

manufacturing which is consistent with the proposed project land uses. At buildout, the project's overall GFA will be 428,169 SF of buildable space, which is in conformance with the Development Intensity Table in the UCP. Additionally, the vehicle trips are in conformance with the Development Intensity Table in the UCP as no increase is proposed above the present entitlements.

Additionally, the purpose of the CPIOZ-B is to provide supplemental development regulations that are tailored to specific sites within community plan areas of the City. The intent of these regulations is to ensure that development proposals are reviewed for consistency with the use and development criteria that have been adopted for specific sites as part of the community plan update process. The project is consistent with the IE designation and the IP 1-1 zone, both of which allow for the R&D land uses. As identified in the UCP, the property development standards for the IP zone are intended to create a campus-like environment characterized by comprehensive site design, substantial landscaping, and amenities that serve the surrounding development in a manner that preserves the industrial nature of the zones. Further, the UCP states specifically for the IP 1-1 zone, the development standards the zone are intended to encourage sound industrial development by providing an attractive environment free from adverse impacts associated with some heavy industrial uses. The project meets these standards by proposing a R&D facility that would have an onsite amenity village that would create a unified campus like setting and 1.5 acres of open space in addition to proposed landscaping.

The purpose of the CHLOZ is to provide a supplemental height limit for buildings and structures located in specific coastal areas. For the project site, the structures are not to exceed 30 feet from ground elevation. The site ranges from approximately 435 AMSL at the highest elevation of the property to 350 feet AMSL at the lowest elevation of the property and is located above the 100-year floodplain. The topography of the site creates various building heights. However, the proposed structures and any projections will not exceed to the maximum height limit allowed by CHLOZ and complies with the N-App Area-1 Zone.

The project is within APZ 2 of MCAS Miramar. This classification corresponds to certain Department of Defense (DOD) land use recommendations that restrict the types of land uses and the number of employees onsite. The project would not increase the development intensity, and the project was previously determined to conform with the ALUCP (pre-2008) that was effective at the time of the previous entitlements, In addition, the proposed land uses, and intensity are allowed by right or as an accessory use under both the City's ALUCP regulations and Industrial Zone.

The purpose of the PIOZ Coastal-Impact Zone is to provide supplemental parking regulations for specified coastal beach and campus areas that have parking impacts. The intent of this overlay zone is to identify areas of high parking demand and increase the off-street parking requirements. Accordingly, the project would provide a 261,547-SF parking garage, 110,518 SF of new subterranean parking space, and 101 surface parking spaces. In accordance with the standards (SDMC 142.0530(c) and Table 142-05G R&D use in a TPA, the project would provide a total of 1,487 parking spaces.

The project site is identified in the General Plan's Economic Prosperity Element as Prime Industrial Land on Figure EP-I. Prime industrial lands are areas that support export-oriented base sector activities such as warehouse distribution, heavy or light manufacturing, research and development uses. These areas are part of even larger areas that provide a significant benefit to the regional economy and meet General Plan goals and objectives to encourage a strong economic base. The proposed project is located within the Torrey Pines Subarea of the UCP and is designated for

scientific use. The development of 428,169 SF of new R&D would help provide additional quality job opportunities including middle-income jobs and provide secondary employment and supporting uses. Retention and growth of scientific research use in this area would also provide greater opportunities for collaboration with other scientific research uses in the immediate vicinity, in the Torrey Pines Mesa area of the community as well as with University of California San Diego. The project will also provide accessory uses and space to serve to the tenants of the campus, thereby implementing the goals and policies of the UCP to provide amenities and support services to the primary scientific research and other industrial uses in industrial areas.

The proposed development is requesting the following deviations from the SDMC and the UCP CPIOZ-B, which will be processed through the NDP. These deviations will not adversely affect coastal policies, resources, or the Implementation Program.

- A deviation from SDMC Section 131.0631, Table 131-06C, for the required rear setback within the IP-1-1 zone. A 25-foot front setback is required, while a setback of 15-feet is provided.
- A deviation from the UCP CPIOZ-B for the required setback from North Torrey Pines Road. A 50-foot setback is required, while a variable setback ranging from 25-feet to 50-feet is provided.
- A deviation from SDMC Section 142.0560 (J) 1, Table 142-05M for the maximum driveway width permitted. A 25-foot-wide driveway is the maximum permitted, while a 30-foot-wide driveway is proposed.

These design features are not consistent with the CPIOZ-B; however, with the acceptance of the deviation, no land use conflicts resulting in physical impacts would occur. Overall, the project is consistent with the intended land uses and development standards of the SDMC, UCP, and CPIOZ-B as discussed above. The project would not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project.

The project would result in a continuation of similar activities occurring at the site and be within the parameters of the types of actions envisioned to occur with implementation of the approved projects. Therefore, this change would not result in additional land use impacts beyond those identified in the prior environmental documents The revised project would not change the previous findings with respect to land use.

Based on the foregoing analysis and information, there is no evidence that implementation of the project would require a major change to the conclusions in the prior environmental documents. The project would not result in any new significant impacts nor a substantial increase in the severity of impacts from that described in the previously certified SEIR or adopted MNDs.

### **Transportation/Circulation**

### 1993 EIR

The 1993 SEIR found the project would generate a total of 2,285 average daily trips (ADT), an increase of 1,309 ADT over existing conditions, exceeding traffic volumes projected in the Community Plan and contributing to direct and cumulative level of services (LOS) impacts to

roadways, intersections, and freeway ramps in the vicinity of the project site. Even with the inclusion of mitigation measures in the 1993 SEIR, these impacts were considered significant unmitigated impacts of the project. No significant parking impacts were identified.

#### 2005 MND 6655

The 2005 MND 6655 found that the project would not result in a significant increase in traffic, would comply with parking requirements, would not impact public access to open space resources or cause increased hazards or conflicts with any plans or policies supporting alternative transportation.

#### 2005 MND 5844

The 2005 MND 5844 found that the project would not result in a significant increase in traffic, would comply with parking requirements, would not impact public access to open space resources or cause increased hazards or conflicts with any plans or policies supporting alternative transportation.

### **Proposed Project**

Implementation of the project would occur within the same parcels evaluated in the prior environmental documents. For evaluating consistency with the transportation significance conclusions of these prior environmental documents, Rick Engineering prepared a Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Assessment Memorandum for the proposed project.

Senate Bill (SB) 743, signed into law on September 27, 2037, began a process that fundamentally changes the way transportation impact analysis is conducted under CEQA. Related revisions to the State's CEQA Guidelines include elimination of auto delay, LOS, and similar measurements of vehicular roadway capacity and traffic congestion as the basis for determining significant transportation impacts. In December 2018, the California Resources Agency certified and adopted revised CEQA Guidelines, including new Section 15064.3. Under the new section, VMT, which includes the amount and distance of automobile traffic attributable to a project, is identified as the "most appropriate measure of transportation impacts." As of July 1, 2020, all CEQA lead agencies must analyze a project's transportation impacts using VMT.

The Memorandum was prepared in accordance with the City of San Diego Transportation Study Manual (TSM; September 29, 2020), which is consistent with the CEQA guidelines and utilizes VMT as a metric for evaluating transportation-related impacts.

#### VMT Screening Assessment

The existing and proposed uses for the project site are Scientific Research and Development, which would fall within the Commercial Employment category for VMT purposes. Therefore, the following VMT screening criterion from the City of San Diego's Transportation Study Manual was utilized to determine if the project would be screened out from VMT analysis due to project characteristics and/or location:

 Commercial Employment Project Located in VMT Efficient Area (15 percent or more below average VMT/employee) The San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) San Diego Region SB 743 VMT Maps from the Traffic Forecast Information Center (TFIC) SB 743 VMT Web App provides the following information about census tract 83.39, in which the project site is located:

- San Diego County Series 14 (Base Year 2016) Regional Mean VMT per Employee: 27.2
- Project Site Census Tract VMT per Employee: 32.1
- Percent of Regional Mean VMT per Employee: 118.0%

The census tract in which the project site is located is shown to generate 32.1 VMT per employee, or 118.0 percent of the regional mean; therefore, the project site is note located in a VMT-efficient area and is not screened out from VMT analysis.

#### Significance Determination

Since the project did not satisfy the above screening criterion, it must evaluate the VMT produced by the project. This commercial employment project generates less than 2,400 daily unadjusted driveway trips and therefore, the project's VMT per employee will be considered the same as the VMT per employee of the census tract which it is located.

As stated above, the project is in a census tract with 32.1 VMT per employee, or 118.0 percent of the regional mean. The proposed project would have a significant VMT impact based on the significance threshold for a commercial employment project of 15 percent below the regional mean VMT per employee. Therefore, mitigation is required to reduce the project's VMT impact to the greatest extent feasible.

Although the project is within the COZ and not yet subject to the Complete Communities: Mobility Choices ordinance (effective January 8, 2021 outside the Coastal Zone), the project has chosen to participate in the City's Complete Communities Mobility Choices Program and rely upon the Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations (SOC) from the Complete Communities: Housing Solutions and Mobility Choices Final Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) as mitigation to the extent feasible for its significant unmitigated VMT transportation impact.

The SDMC Ordinance Number O-21274, adopted on December 9, 2020, provides the development regulations for the Mobility Choices portion of the Complete Communities program. According to the Ordinance, the project is located in Mobility Zone 2. Mobility Zone 2 means any premises located either partially or entirely within a TPA.

SDMC Section 143.1103(b) indicates the requirement for the application of VMT Reduction Measures for all development located within Mobility Zone 2 in accordance with the Land Development Manual Appendix T. The Land Development Manual Appendix T provides a list of VMT Reduction Measures that are split into a series of categories, which include Pedestrian Measures, Bicycle Supportive Measures, Transit Supportive Measures, and Other Measures. Each of the individual measures is given an assigned point value per unit of measure.

For development in Mobility Zone 2, SDMC Section 143.1103(b)(1) identifies the requirement to provide VMT Reduction Measures totaling at least 5 points. SDMC Section 143.1103(b)(5) indicates that in lieu of providing the VMT Reduction Measures in Section 143.1103(b)(1) or (2), the applicant may pay the Active Transportation In Lieu Fee referenced in Section 14.1103(c).

The project will provide measures as required by the ordinance that add up to at least 5 points as identified in the Land Development Manual Appendix T. The Project will obtain at least 5 points through the following measures shown in Table 3, *VMT Reduction Measures for Mobility Choices Compliance*, below.

1	Bicycle Supportive Measures Providing on-site bicycle repair station.	The project will provide an on-site	Yes/No	Unit	AND THE PARTY			
	Providing on-site bicycle repair station.	The project will provide an on-site						
2	I I was a first of the second state of the sec	bicycle repair station.	Yes	1.50				
ton. J	Upgrading bicycle infrastructure adjacent to the development (along roadway and at intersections, i.e.,	The project will restripe Science Park Road from North Torrey Pines Road to Torreyana Road to provide a buffered	Each upgraded feature	2.50	0.0			
	signage, green paint, upgrade to a protected bicycle facility, etc. above required minimum bicycle infrastructure standards).	Class II bike lane in each direction of travel. The project will also install bicycle "sharrow" pavement markings along Torreyana Road and Callan Road to provide a circuitous bicycle route	er Tresstapientess Tresstation	YC CIVIN S S S S S S S S S S S S S	Ban. Leith			
0.19	general man and the second	around the project site.		i and	6 3.05			
3	Providing on-site showers/lockers at least 10% beyond the minimum requirement	The project will provide 12 showers and 120 lockers. The project is required to provide a minimum of 7 showers and 26	Yes	2.00	i que			
		lockers.						
	Transit Supportive Measures							
4	Providing high-cost amenities/ upgraded features to an existing transit stop (above existing condition), i.e., addition of shelter, real time bus information monitors.	The project will provide a bus shelter, bench and a trash receptable for the transit bus stop located along northbound North Torrey Pines Road approximately 100 feet north of Science Park Road.	Each upgraded feature	2.50	ि तम्मू 5-26- 56(41) - 5-5 - 5-5			
5	Providing low-cost amenities/ upgraded features to an existing transit stop (above existing condition), i.e., addition of bench public art, static schedule and route display, trash receptacle.	The project will provide a bench and a trash receptable for the transit bus stop located along northbound North Torrey Pines Road approximately 300 feet north of Callan Road.	Each upgraded feature	2.00	ander Stand generi			
	growend when of the UCA CONTROL diverse UCA Time protock setups for here, subset of movies pathenelling submeric Phan Phano Control Phanelling movies of moreorean sint and setup.	The project will provide route signage and benches for the four existing MTS Route 978 transit bus stops located along Science Park Road (one stop), Torreyana Road (two stops), and Callan Road (one stop). Total Project VMT Reduction Measure	Each upgraded feature	2.00	Total of 8.00 points			

### Table 3 VMT REDUCTION MEASURES FOR MOBILITY CHOICES COMPLIANCE

As shown in Table 3, the project's proposed VMT reduction measures total to 18.50 points, and a minimum of 5 points is required to opt in. Therefore, the project will opt in to follow the Mobility Choices program regulations as mitigation to the extent feasible by relying upon the Findings and

SOCs from the Complete Communities: Housing Solutions and Mobility Choices Final PEIR for its significant VMT impact.

Based on the foregoing analysis and information presented, there is no evidence that implementation of the project would require a major change to the conclusions in the prior environmental documents. The project would not result in any new significant impacts nor a substantial increase in the severity of impacts from that described in the previously certified SEIR or adopted MNDs.

### **Aesthetics/Visual Quality**

#### 1993 EIR

The 1993 SEIR determined that visual impacts of the proposed project would not be significant.

### 2005 MND 6655

The Aesthetics/Neighborhood Character section of the 2005 MND 6655 found that the proposed project was similar to surrounding uses, would conform to established height limits, would not be out of scale with surrounding uses and would not generate substantial light, glare, or shading impacts.

### 2005 MND 5844

The Aesthetics/Neighborhood Character section of the 2005 MND 5844 found that the proposed project was similar to surrounding uses, would conform to established height limits, would not be out of scale with surrounding uses and would not generate substantial light, glare, or shading impacts. The removal of the non-native trees on site were not considered significant because they were not distinctive and not considered "landmarks". These trees were also to be replaced by Torrey Pines and Coast Live Oaks. Further, changes in topography due to the extensive cut for the parking area were found to be less than significant due to the proposed screened and landscaped retaining walls.

### **Proposed Project**

Implementation of the project would occur within the same parcels evaluated in the prior environmental documents. The project site is within the planning boundaries of the UCP. The UCP does not identify any scenic vistas within the project area. According to UCP, the project site is classified with the land use IE and zoned as IP-1-1, which allows for high quality business park with R&D uses and limited manufacturing. The project site currently supports four structures that house R&D and supporting uses. The immediate surrounding land uses consist of restaurant and industrial uses to the north, hotels, restaurants, a spa, and the Torrey Pines Golf Course to the west, and medical laboratories and research centers to the east and south.

As identified in the UCP, the property development standards for the IP zone are intended to create a campus-like environment characterized by comprehensive site design, substantial landscaping, and amenities that serve the surrounding development in a manner that preserves the industrial nature of the zones. Further, the UCP states specifically for the IP-1-1 zone, the development

standards of this zone are intended to encourage sound industrial development by providing an attractive environment free from adverse impacts associated with some heavy industrial uses. Consistent with these development standards, the project entails the reconfiguration and expansion of the existing site to provide additional R&D office/lab space and an amenity village that would include uses such as food and beverage and retail. As such, the project would create a unified campus like setting that would be inclusive of providing both employment and ancillary employee needs in concert with a comprehensive design as envisioned for the IP zone. The project would not introduce any new land uses, particularly no heavy industrial land uses or those not approved for the zone. The project includes the 1.5 acres of open space previously approved under prior development permits. Moreover, the existing land uses are two stories in height, the proposed land uses would not extend greater than two stories above the ground surface, maintaining visually compatibility with the existing character in terms of development patterns, building forms, and bulk and scale.

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) manages the State Scenic Highway Program and maintains a list of official and eligible state scenic highways. A "state scenic highway" refers to any interstate, state, or county road that has been officially designated as scenic and thereby requires special scenic conservation treatment. There are no designated state scenic highways in the vicinity of the project site; the nearest officially designated state scenic highway is State Route (SR) 163, nine miles to the southeast of the project site. I-5 from mile marker 14 near the Coronado Bridge northward to SR 74 near San Juan Capistrano in Orange County and SR 52 from La Jolla to SR 67 are listed as eligible state scenic highways. I-5 is approximately one-mile east and SR 52 is approximately 4.5-miles to the south of the project site.

Currently, the existing light sources at the site and surrounding land uses are those typical of industrial parks and include parking lot lighting, exterior and interior building lights, and security and ambient lighting. There is also nearby street lighting along Callan Road, North Torrey Pines Road, and Torreyana Road.

As evaluated in the prior environmental documentation, the project would include lighting typical of industrial park and commercial land uses; such lighting would not create a new source of substantial light that would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area. Sources of light would include interior light emanating from the buildings and exterior lighting for security, ambience, and signage. Largely, the project lighting would be similar to the existing land uses. Moreover, as with the approved projects, lighting would be regulated by compliance with Section 142.0740 of the City Land Development Code. Similar to the approved projects and the existing structures, the project would incorporate glass on the building exterior to serve as windows for the building. In accordance with Section 142.0730 of the Land Development Code, glass material having a light reflectivity greater than 30 percent would not be incorporated into the project's exterior. Those areas that would provide glass material would be tempered where required and would not result in the reflection of natural or artificial light off of the glass such that a safety impact to motorists on surrounding roadways would occur. Impacts would be less than significant.

Thus, the project would result in a continuation of similar activities occurring at the site and be within the parameters of the types of actions envisioned to occur with implementation of the approved projects. With the inclusion of the landscape plan, the prior environmental documents for the approved projects identified that there would be less than significant impacts to aesthetics.

Likewise, the revised project would not change any of the previous findings with respect to visual impacts.

Based on the foregoing analysis and information, there is no evidence that implementation of the project would require a major change to the conclusions in the prior environmental documents. The project would not result in any new significant impacts nor a substantial increase in the severity of impacts from that described in the previously certified SEIR or adopted MNDs.

### **Agricultural Resources**

### 1993 EIR

The 1993 SEIR determined that no significant adverse effects were identified in relation to Natural Resources (Agricultural Resources). Specifically, the SEIR identified that the site was zoned for scientific research and development uses, and therefore, the proposed project would not convert agricultural land to nonagricultural use nor impair the agricultural productivity of agricultural land.

#### 2005 MND 6655

The 2005 MND 6655 found that no Agricultural Resources existed on site and no impacts would occur.

### 2005 MND 5844

The 2005 MND 5844 found that no Agricultural Resources existed on site and no impacts would occur.

### **Proposed Project**

Implementation of the project would occur within the same parcels evaluated in the prior environmental documents. The Department of Conservation (DOC) Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP) classifies the project site as Urban Built Up and the project site is not within an established agricultural preserve (DOC 2021; City 2008).

Public Resources Code Section 12220(g) defines "forest land" as land that can support 10 percent native cover of any species, including hardwoods, under natural conditions, and that allows for management of one or more forest resources, including timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, and other public benefits. Based on this definition, no forest land occurs within the project site. Moreover, there is no land zoned as forest land or timberland that exists within the project site or within its vicinity. There are scattered trees throughout the site; however, there are no concentration of trees within the site that would constitute a forest.

The project would result in a continuation of similar activities occurring at the site and be within the parameters of the types of actions envisioned to occur with implementation of the approved projects. The prior environmental documents for the approved projects identified that there would be no impacts to agricultural resources or forestry resources. As such, the revised project would not change any of the findings with respect to agricultural and forestry impacts.

Based on the foregoing analysis and information, there is no evidence that implementation of the project would require a major change to the conclusions in the prior environmental documents. The project would not result in any new significant impacts nor a substantial increase in the severity of impacts from that described in the previously certified SEIR or adopted MNDs.

### **Air Quality**

#### 1993 EIR

The 1993 SEIR found that the project would contribute to significant unmitigable cumulative air quality impacts associates with increased traffic emissions and conflict with the Regional Air Quality Strategy.

#### 2005 MND 6655

2005 MND 665 found that the project would not substantially increase emissions associated with vehicular trips, was consistent with the air quality management plan, and would not generate substantial odors or otherwise impact sensitive receptors. Standard dust control measures were determined to avoid impacts associated with construction.

### 2005 MND 5844

The 2005 MND 5844 found that project would not substantially increase emissions associated with vehicular trips, was consistent with the air quality management plan, and would not generate substantial odors or otherwise impact sensitive receptors. Standard dust control measures were determined to avoid impacts associated with construction.

#### **Proposed Project**

Implementation of the project would occur within the same parcels evaluated in the prior environmental documents. HELIX Environmental Planning Inc. (HELIX) prepared an Air Quality Technical Report for the proposed project in February 2022. The results of which are summarized below.

Strategies to achieve emission reductions in the San Diego Air Basin (SDAB) are developed in the Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) and Attainment Plan for incorporation into the State Implementation Plan (SIP), prepared by the San Diego Air Pollution Control District (SDAPCD) for the region. Both the RAQS and Attainment Plan are based on SANDAG population projections, as well as land use designations and population projections included in general plans for those communities located within the County. Population growth is typically associated with the construction of residential units or large employment centers.

A project would be inconsistent with the RAQS and Attainment Plan (and thus the SIP) if it results in population and/or employment growth that exceed growth estimates for the area and thereby considered to have a potentially significant impact. While potential conflicts with the SIP may occur when a proposed development, such as the proposed project, seeks to increase the amount of R&D, retail, and food and beverage uses at the project site, the effect on anticipated regional population and employment is also important. Because the project does not involve housing, no direct adverse

impacts to population or housing would occur from development of the proposed project. Similarly, indirect impacts to population and housing are not anticipated as the jobs provided by the project are expected to be filled by the local labor pool and the project would therefore not result in the migration of workers into the area or result in the construction of new housing. Rather, the addition of R&D, retail, and food and beverage uses on the project site would provide for additional job opportunities in an area that already supports extensive employment for an existing population.

In addition, the project would be consistent with the previously entitled 428,160 SF of employment generating uses and would be developed to include smart growth concepts in a TPA through the provision of on-site retail and food and beverage uses to support the project's existing and proposed R&D uses. This development style, in addition to the project's proximity to alternative transportation, would help reduce the average VMT for on-site employees, thus reducing pollutant emissions from personal vehicle trips from project employees. Therefore, it is unlikely that the land uses and employment from the project would interfere with the SDAPCD's goals for improving air quality in the SDAB. Impacts associated with conformance to regional air quality plans would be less than significant.

The project would generate criteria pollutants in the short-term during construction and the longterm during operation. To determine whether a project would result in emissions that would violate an air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, a project's emissions are evaluated based on the quantitative emission thresholds established by the SDAPCD. The project's construction and operational emissions were estimated using CalEEMod. Modeling indicates that emissions of all criteria pollutants related to project construction and operation would be below the SDAPCD's significance thresholds. Therefore, direct impacts from criteria pollutants generated would be less than significant. Further, emissions during construction and operation would not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. Therefore, construction and operation emissions would not be cumulatively considerable, and the impact would be less than significant.

The project was also evaluated to determine if the project would result in potential impacts in relation to carbon monoxide (CO) hotpots, toxic air contaminants (TAC), and odors. Relative to CO hotspots, the project was screened out of any further analysis due to location, traffic volume, and vehicle mix. The proposed project also was determined to have less than TAC and odor impacts there would be relatively few pieces of off-road, heavy-duty diesel equipment used during construction, and the construction period would be relatively short. Operational TACs are generally associated with diesel particulate emissions, industrial manufacturing processes, automotive repair facilities, and dry-cleaning facilities. Comparative to the proposed land uses, sources such as coffee roasters and laboratories, the emissions are required to be inventoried annually to determine whether emissions are above the thresholds requiring emissions reductions. Land uses associated with odor complaints include agricultural uses, wastewater treatment plants, food processing plants, chemical plants, composting activities, refineries, landfills, dairies, and fiberglass molding operations (SCAQMD 1993). The project would not include any of these uses nor are there any of these land uses in the project vicinity. Emissions from construction equipment, such as diesel exhaust, and VOCs from architectural coatings and paving activities may generate odors; however, these odors would be temporary, intermittent, and not expected to affect a substantial number of people.

The project would result in a continuation of similar activities occurring at the site and be within the parameters of the types of actions envisioned to occur with implementation of the approved

projects. The prior environmental documents for the approved projects identified that there would be no impacts to air quality. As such, the revised project would not change any of the findings with respect to air quality impacts.

Based on the foregoing analysis and information, there is no evidence that implementation of the project would require a major change to the conclusions in the prior environmental document. The project would not result in any new significant impacts nor a substantial increase in the severity of impacts from that described in the previously certified SEIR or adopted MNDs.

### **Biological Resources**

### 1993 EIR

The 1993 SEIR identified direct impacts of coastal mixed chaparral habitat, orange-throated whiptail lizard, wart-stemmed ceanothus, and Cooper's hawk. Mitigation was provided through the dedication of a 1.5-acre open space easement that would preserve an area in the northeast portion of the site. With implementation of the proposed mitigation, impacts to Biological Resources were found to be less than significant.

### 2005 MND 6655

Due to the proposed construction limits of this project being outside any identified resource areas, the 2005 MND 6655 identified no biological resources impacts would occur associated with any Biological Resources topics.

### 2005 MND 5844

The 2005 MND 5844 assumed impacts to 0.08 acre of Diegan coastal sage scribe, 0.11 acre of southern mixed chaparral and 5.87 acres of developed land, resulting in significant Biological Resources impacts. Because the impacted area was less than 5 acres, mitigation was established requiring the applicant to pay into the City's Habitat Acquisition Fund. With payment of these funds, the Biological Resources impacts were considered reduced to below a level of significance.

#### **Proposed Project**

Implementation of the project would occur within the same parcels evaluated in the prior environmental documents. HELIX prepared a Biological Technical Report (BTR) for the proposed project in December 2021. The results of which are summarized below.

The proposed project has been specifically designed to occur within existing developed and disturbed areas associated with previous development and avoid impacts to sensitive biological resources to the greatest extent possible. However, the proposed project would result in direct impacts to 20.7 acres of habitat or land cover types. These impacts include 0.2 acre of sensitive upland habitat comprised of southern maritime chaparral and 20.5 acres of non-sensitive habitat comprised of developed land. Additionally, construction of a pedestrian walkway would impact less than 0.01 acre of developed land located within the existing open space parcel. Impacts to southern maritime chaparral are considered significant and require mitigation.

The field survey conducted as part of the BTR identified two special plant species: wart-stemmed ceanothus and Torrey pine. Further investigation concluded impacts to individual wart-stemmed ceanothus would not jeopardize the continued viability of wart-stemmed ceanothus within the region however, impacts are still considered significant and require mitigation. The Torrey pines onsite were planted as part of site landscaping and thus, are not naturally occurring. As such, these individuals are not considered sensitive and do not require protection.

While no special status animal species were detected onsite, impacts to the 0.2-acre sensitive uplands habitats could result in impacts special status animal species that have the potential to occur in such habitat. Three animal species were determined to have a high potential to occur: Belding's orange whiptail, San Diego tiger whiptail, and Cooper's hawk. None of these are federally or state listed species or City narrow endemic species. Belding's orange-throated whiptail and Cooper's hawk are a California Department of Fish and Wildlife Watch List species and MSCP covered species. San Diego tiger whiptail is a CDFW Species of Special Concern.

The project could potentially impact Belding's orange-throated and San Diego tiger whiptail individuals through operation of heavy equipment within and adjacent to suitable upland habitat with potential to support these species. As a condition of project approval, biological monitoring shall be required including installation perimeter fencing. As such potential direct impacts to individuals would be less than significant. Potential impacts to Belding's orange whiptail and San Diego tiger whiptail are considered less than significant as suitable habitat for these species would continue to be preserved within the open space parcel. Furthermore, a sufficient amount of habitat for these species has already been conserved within the surrounding area (i.e., MHPA and Torrey Pines State Nature Reserve).

The project could result in impacts to Cooper's hawk, if individuals were determined to be nesting on or within 300 feet of the project site during project construction. As a condition of project approval, preconstruction surveys for nesting birds and raptors would be required prior to the removal of habitat with potential to support active nests during the breeding season (February 1 to September 15). The proposed project would comply with the conditions for coverage for this species through establishment of the required 300-foot avoidance setback if nesting Cooper's hawk are found. The project would not impact oak woodlands or oak riparian forests as neither community occurs within the project site. This is consistent with the conditions of coverage for the Cooper's hawk that requires the minimization of disturbance to those habitats.

The project would result in impacts to Biological Resources, therefore, a MMRP, as detailed within Section VII of the Addendum, would be required. As described in Section VII, the MMRP would require offsite conservation of impacted upland habitats and Wart-stemmed Ceanothus. With implementation of the MMRP, potential impacts on Biological Resources would be reduced to below a level of significance. Based on the foregoing analysis and information, the project would not result in any new significant impacts nor a substantial increase in the severity of impacts from that described in the previously certified SEIR or adopted MNDs.

### Energy

### 1993 EIR

The 1993 SEIR determined that no significant adverse effects were identified in relation to Energy. Specifically, the proposed project would consume typical amounts of fossil fuels, electricity, and other energy resources but would not consume inordinate or unreasonable amounts of energy during its construction or after completion.

### 2005 MND 6655

The 2005 MND 6655 found that the project would not use excessive amounts of fuel or energy.

### 2005 MND 5844

The 2005 MND 5844 found that the project would not use excessive amounts of fuel or energy.

### **Proposed Project**

Implementation of the project would occur within the same parcels evaluated in the prior environmental documents. As is typical of any construction, the project would temporarily consume energy for the operation of construction equipment and vehicles. During construction, standard methods of earthmoving and other associated construction activities are planned. Construction activities would not include methods of construction that would result in inefficient or unnecessary use of energy resources. Once operational, the project would result in a continuation of the similar ongoing R&D and associated activities occurring at the site and be within the parameters of the types of projects envisioned to occur in compliance with the approved projects.

In relation to conflicting or obstructing a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency, several levels of government have implemented regulatory programs in response to reducing greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) emissions, which consequently serve to increase energy efficiency. Several state agencies, including CARB, California Energy Commission, California Public Utilities Commission, CalRecycle, Caltrans, and the Department of Water Resources have developed regulatory and incentive programs that promote energy efficiency. Many of the measures are generally beyond the ability of any future development to implement and are implemented at the utility provider or the manufacturer level.

Locally, the City of San Diego adopted its Climate Action Plan (CAP) in December 2015, which provides the framework for reducing the City's GHG emissions and consequently improving energy efficiency. Often local energy conservation plans and goals, such as those in the City's CAP are devised based upon the anticipated land uses within a planning area as outlined in planning documents including a City's General Plan or Zoning Ordinance. The project is consistent with the land use designation in the UCP and the City's IP-1-1 zone.

The project would result in a continuation of similar activities occurring at the site and be within the parameters of the types of actions envisioned to occur with implementation of the approved projects. The prior environmental documents for the approved projects identified that there would

be no impacts to energy resources. As such, the revised project would not change any of the findings with respect to impacts.

Based on the foregoing analysis and information, there is no evidence that implementation of the project would require a major change to the conclusions in the prior environmental documents. The project would not result in any new significant impacts nor a substantial increase in the severity of impacts from that described in the certified SEIR or adopted MNDs.

### **Geology/Soils**

### 1993 EIR

The 1993 SEIR determined that no significant adverse effects were identified in relation to Geology/Soils. Specifically, the proposed project would not result in the exposure of people or property to geologic hazards such as earthquakes, landslides, mudslides, ground failure, or similar hazards as the San Diego region has been characterized by low seismic activity. The proposed project would be designed and constructed to conform to California Building Code (CBC) standards.

### 2005 MND 6655

The 2005 MND 6655 found that although the project site is located in Geological Hazard Category 51, which has a nominal level of risk, the geotechnical report prepared for the project found that the site was suitable for the proposed development and with standard construction methods and best management practices (BMPs) no significant impacts would occur.

### 2005 MND 5844

The 2005 MND 5844 found that although the project site is located in Geological Hazard Category 52, which has a nominal level of risk, the geotechnical report prepared for the project found that the site was suitable for the proposed development and with standard construction methods and BMPs no significant impacts would occur.

### **Proposed Project**

Geocon prepared a Geotechnical Investigation for the proposed project in September 2021. The Geotechnical Investigation contains several recommendations that are designed to meet the criteria set forth in the CBC, which is adopted into the SDMC as Chapter 145.0101. Accordingly, these recommendations are required by the CBC and are incorporated as project design features that would be included as conditions of approval.

Implementation of the project would occur within the same parcels evaluated in the prior environmental documents. The City's General Plan Figure PF-9 (Geo-Technical and Relative Risk Areas) identifies the project site as within an area of nominal to low geotechnical risk (City 2007). No known active faults have been mapped at the site. Per the City's Seismic Safety Study (2008), the project site is located within Geologic Hazard Category Hazard Category 51: Level Mesas – underlain by terrace deposits and bedrock, nominal risk and 52: Other Terrain – Other level areas, gently sloping to steep terrain, favorable geologic structure; Low Risk. The project site is not located within a currently established Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. The closest known active surface faults are the Newport-Inglewood and Rose Canyon faults approximately two miles west of the site. Therefore, the risk associated with ground rupture hazard is low. Additionally, the site has little topographical variation, ranging from 350 feet to 435 feet AMSL. Observations and geologic mapping indicate landslides are not present on or adjacent to the site. Due to the lack of a permanent, near-surface groundwater table and the very dense nature of the underlying geologic formations, the potential for liquefaction is low.

Given the history of ground disturbance across the site from past development activities, it is unlikely that any natural topsoil remains in the upper soil layers.

The Geotechnical Investigation includes recommendations that are designed to meet the CBC standards and have been incorporated into the project as design features that would be adopted as conditions of approval. Mandatory compliance with applicable seismic-safety development requirements would minimize potential effects related to reduce impacts to people or structures due to local seismic events to an acceptable level of risk.

The project would result in a continuation of similar activities occurring at the site and be within the parameters of the types of actions envisioned to occur with implementation of the approved projects. The prior environmental documents for the approved projects identified that there would be no impacts to geology and soils. As such, the revised project would not change any of the findings with respect to impacts.

Based on the foregoing analysis and information, there is no evidence that implementation of the project would require a major change to the conclusions in the prior environmental documents. The project would not result in any new significant impacts nor a substantial increase in the severity of impacts from that described in the previously certified SEIR or adopted MNDs.

### Historic Resources (Archaeological)

#### 1989/1993 EIR

Although the 1993 SEIR found that project impacts to significant cultural resource site SDI-12581 were limited because the site was located in the proposed open space easement area, potential impacts were identified due to its proximity of proposed development areas. Mitigation measures incorporated into the 1993 SEIR requiring monitoring and capping of any resources were expected to reduce this potential impact to less than significant.

#### 2005 MND 6655

The 2005 MND 6655 found that substantial known resources associated with Site SDI-12581 existed in the northwestern portion of the site in an "area of archaeological constraints" that may be impacted by the project. Additionally, because there was no evidence that prior mass grading had occurred elsewhere onsite, the potential to encounter other buried cultural resources during construction was significant. With the proposed mitigation, the project would result in a less than significant impact to Historical Resources.

### 2005 MND 5844

The 2005 MND 5844 did not identify any architecturally significant buildings of structures onsite. Further, it was determined that while possible, due to the amount of disturbance that occurred with the development of the site the potential for impacting Historic Resources (Archaeology) onsite was somewhat reduced (in comparison to an undeveloped site). However, it was determined that Historic Resources (Archaeology) could exist below the surface parking lot, and the excavation of this area could result in significant impacts. Mitigation in the form of monitoring for any areas involving trenching in previously undisturbed or undocumented soils was required. With implementation of this mitigation, impacts to Historic Resources were found to be less than significant.

### **Proposed Project**

Implementation of the project would occur within the same parcels evaluated in the prior environmental documents. A Historical Resource Technical Report was prepared for the proposed project in order to determine the potential historical and/or architectural significance of a one-story, research and development office building located at 10931-10933 North Torrey Pines Road. The City's determination of significance of impacts on historical resources is based on the criteria found in Section 15064.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines. The determination of significance for historic buildings, structures, objects, and landscapes is based on age, location, context, association with an important person or event, uniqueness, and integrity.

Historical research indicates that the building located at 10931-10933 Torrey Pines Road is not historically and/or architecturally significant. The building is not associated with any important events or individuals; does not embody the distinctive characteristics of a style, type, period, or method of modern contemporary construction; does not represent the notable work of a "master" architect and/or important, creative individual, or possess high artistic values (Moomjiam 2021). Consequently, the building is not eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR), the California Historic Resources Inventory, or the San Diego Historical Resources Board Register.

In addition to the Historical Resource Technical Report, HELIX prepared a Cultural Resources Study including a records search, Sacred Lands File search, Native American outreach, review of previous archaeological studies of the project site, a review of historic aerial photographs and maps, and a pedestrian survey was conducted for the project area and an off-site parcel potentially to be used as a biological mitigation area.

The records search conducted at the South Coastal Information Center (SCIC) on January 9, 2020 indicated that 111 previous cultural resources studies have been conducted within three-fourths mile of the project area, two of which occurred within the project area. The records search results also indicated that a total of 52 cultural resources have been previously recorded within three-fourths mile of the project area; one of which, P-37-012581 (CA-SDI-12581 [SDM-W-6]) has been documented within the project site. Several archaeological studies have been conducted at P-37-012581, beginning in the 1920s or 1930s. Previous research at P-37-012581 recommended the site as a significant cultural resource; while disturbed by previous developments on the property, any intact portions of the site would likely meet criteria for inclusion in the CRHR.

The field investigations for the current project included intensive pedestrian survey of the portion of the project area that currently remains undeveloped and of the off-site parcel by HELIX staff and a Native American monitor on December 12, 2019. The survey resulted in the identification of cultural material associated with P-37-012581 within the portion of the project site that does not currently support development.

P-37-012581 is a historical resource (i.e., significant cultural resource) under CEQA and the City's Historic Resources Guidelines and Regulations. The site is also recommended as eligible for designation by the City's Historical Resources Board. Therefore, impacts to the site would constitute significant effects and must be avoided or mitigated to below a level of significance. As currently proposed, the project would avoid development within the existing open space/preservation area, which was previously identified as the most significant area of the site. In addition, a portion of the existing surface parking lot within the significant resource. The portion of the significant resource that is not within dedicated open space or the direct encroachment area would be placed in a non-build easement to protect it from future encroachment. Project development would encroach less than 25 percent into the archaeological site (21.3 percent) and impacts to portions of P-37-012581 that would be affected by project development shall be mitigated through the development and implementation of a research design and data recovery program.

Due to the potential for cultural material to be present outside the mapped boundaries of P-37-012581 and the potential for encountering significant cultural material even after the implementation of the data recovery program, a monitoring program is recommended for all ground-disturbing activity for the project. The monitoring program would follow the City's standard monitoring requirements.

The project would result in impacts to Cultural Resources, therefore, a MMRP, as detailed within Section VII of the Addendum, would be required. As described in Section VII, the MMRP requires a research design and data recovery program in addition to archaeological monitoring during any ground disturbing activities consistent with the City's standard monitoring requirements. With implementation of the MMRP, potential impacts on Cultural Resources would be reduced to below a level of significance. Based on the foregoing analysis and information, there is no evidence that implementation of the project would require a major change to the conclusions of the previous certified SEIR or adopted MNDs.

# Human Health/Public Safety/Hazardous Materials

### 1993 EIR

The Hazardous Materials section of the1993 SEIR found that the use and storage of hazardous materials is regulated by several local agencies, including the County of San Diego, City of San Diego Fire Department, and SDAPCD. Although the project did not propose an updated business plan addressing hazardous materials, the1993 SEIR found that because the project would be required to comply with all applicable regulations, no significant impacts associated with hazardous materials would occur.

### 2005 MND 6655

The 2005 MND 6655 found no impacts associated with on-site hazardous sites, soil contamination or the transport, use, disposal, or risk of upset associated with hazardous materials. The project would also not interfere with any emergency response plans.

### 2005 MND 5844

The 2005 MND 5844 found no impacts associated with on-site hazardous sites, soil contamination or the transport, use, disposal, or risk of upset associated with hazardous materials. The project would also not interfere with any emergency response plans.

### **Proposed Project**

Implementation of the project would occur within the same parcels evaluated in the prior environmental documents. Construction activities associated with the proposed project would require transportation and use of limited quantities of fuel, oil, sealants, and other hazardous materials related to construction. The use of hazardous materials and substances during construction would be subject to federal, state, and local health and safety requirements for handling, storage, and disposal.

A review of the State Water Resources Control Board GeoTracker database and the Department of Toxic Substances Control EnviroStor database provide information on hazardous materials sites. The property at 10933 North Torrey Pines was listed on the Geo Tracker site, in relation to two separate cases that closed in 1994 and 1988 respectively. Due to the status and length of time since closure of these cases, these listings are not considered a human health/public safety/hazardous materials risk.

The project site, like the approved projects, is not within one-quarter mile of any school, the nearest school is Torrey Hills Elementary School, approximately 1.25 miles east of the site. The nearest airfield to the project site is MCAS Miramar, approximately six miles southeast of the project site. The project site is not within the restrictive use area or the 65 dBA Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) boundaries of the ALUCP of MCAS Miramar. The project is however, located within what is categorized as APZ 2, which is a zone beyond the clear zone that is demarcated by the DOD for military installations. Specifically, land use compatibility for APZs is founded on the concept of minimizing density of land use in the vicinity of air installations. In addition to limiting density, certain types of land uses, such as residential development, educational facilities, and medical facilities are considered incompatible and are strongly discouraged in APZs. The project would not increase the development intensity and the project was previously determined to conform with the ALUCP (pre-2008) that was effective at the time of the previous entitlements, In addition, the proposed land uses, and intensity are allowed by right or as an accessory use under both the City's ALUCP regulations and Industrial Zone.

The project would result in a continuation of similar activities occurring at the site and be within the parameters of the types of actions envisioned to occur with implementation of the approved projects. Therefore, this change would not result in additional impacts on human health/public safety/hazardous materials beyond those identified in the prior environmental documents The

revised project would not change the previous findings with respect to human health/public safety/hazardous materials impacts.

Based on the foregoing analysis and information, there is no evidence that implementation of the project would require a major change to the conclusions in the prior environmental documents. The project would not result in any new significant impacts nor a substantial increase in the severity of impacts from that described in the previously certified SEIR or adopted MNDs.

### Hydrology/Water Quality

#### 1993 EIR

The 1993 SEIR identified that while project design features would reduce significant adverse direct impacts on water quality on Los Peñasquitos Lagoon, the project would contribute to a significant cumulative water quality impact to Los Peñasquitos Lagoon and its watershed.

### 2005 MND 6655

The 2005 MND 6655 indicated that identified pollutants of concern would be properly treated through proposed construction and post-construction BMPs, including through filter inserts on catch basins, curb inlets, and trench drains. With the use of these BMPs and proposed detention structures, impacts associated with Hydrology and Water Quality would be less than significant.

### 2005 MND 5844

The project analyzed in the 2005 MND 5844 was identified as a "priority project" requiring completion of a Water Quality Technical Report. The 2005 MND 5844 indicated that to comply with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) pre-construction requirements, a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) would be prepared that would identify appropriate erosion and sediment controls to avoid significant impacts during construction. The 2005 MND 5844 also concluded that pollutants of concern would be properly treated through proposed post-construction BMPs, including through filter inserts on catch basins, curb inlets, and trench drains. With the use of these BMPs and proposed detention structures, impacts associated with Hydrology and Water Quality would be less than significant.

# **Proposed Project**

Implementation of the project would occur within the same parcels evaluated in the prior environmental documents. As with the approved projects, potential impacts to existing water quality standards associated with the project would include minimal short-term construction-related erosion/sedimentation and long-term operational storm water discharge. The project would be subject to the requirements SDMC Section 43.03 and Municipal Storm Water Permit Order No. R9-2013-0001 as amended by R9-2015-0001 and R9-2015-0100, as identified in the City's 2018 update to the City Storm Water Manual and Storm Water Requirements Applicability Checklist. The project would be required to comply with the NPDES Construction General Permit and submit a SWPPP that outlines the intended practices to reduce pollutants in the stormwater to the maximum extent practicable during construction. The SWPPP must include erosion-control and sedimentcontrols. Additionally, the SWPPP is also required to contain waste management and nonstormwater control BMPs that reduce the potential for construction-related stormwater pollutants.

There is no groundwater extraction occurring or planned at the project site; therefore, there would be no disruption to any existing groundwater levels or well production. In relation to impervious surfaces that could interfere with groundwater recharge, the project would occur generally within the footprint of the existing developed portion of the site and result in no additional development intensity in relative to the existing entitlements.

The project would include Low Impact Development (LID) Site Design, Source Control, Pollutant Control and Hydromodification Management BMPs, designed pursuant to the guidelines of the City Storm Water Standards, to achieve water quality treatment and hydromodification management.

The project would result in a continuation of similar activities occurring at the site and be within the parameters of the types of actions envisioned to occur with implementation of the approved projects. Therefore, this change would not result in additional impacts on hydrology and water quality beyond those identified in the prior environmental documents. The revised project would not change the previous findings with respect to hydrology and water quality impacts.

Based on the foregoing analysis and information, there is no evidence that implementation of the project would require a major change to the conclusions in the prior environmental documents. The project would not result in any new significant impacts nor a substantial increase in the severity of impacts from that described in the previously certified SEIR or adopted MNDs.

### Noise

#### 1993 EIR

The 1993 SEIR determined that no significant adverse effects were identified in relation to Noise. Specifically, the proposed project would generate short-term noise impacts ambient noise levels, no exposure of people to noise levels, which exceed the City's noise ordinance, nor exposure of people to transportation noise levels exceeding the standards established in the Transportation Element of the General Plan.

#### 2005 MND 6655

The 2005 MND 6655 found the project could nominally increase ambient noise levels; however, the proposed uses would comply with the City's Noise Ordinance and be consistent with the MCAS APZ-2 allowed land uses.

### 2005 MND 5844

The 2005 MND 5844 found the project would not increase ambient noise levels. Additionally, the proposed uses would comply with the City's Noise Ordinance and be consistent with the MCAS APZ-2 allowed land uses.

### **Proposed Project**

Implementation of the project would occur within the same parcels evaluated in the prior environmental documents. Temporary noise impacts would be associated with on-site grading, use of concrete mixers, and delivery of materials. A significant construction noise impact would occur if temporary construction noise exceeds 75 dB(A)  $L_{EQ}$  at a noise-sensitive land use. Land uses in the vicinity of the project site include restaurant and industrial uses to the north, hotels, restaurants, a spa, and the Torrey Pines Golf Course to the west, and medical laboratories and research centers to the east and south. Construction activity that would create disturbing, excessive, or offensive noise is prohibited between the hours of 7:00 p.m. of any day and 7:00 a.m. of the following day, or on legal holidays as specified in Section 21.04 of the SDMC, with exception of Columbus Day and Washington's Birthday, or on Sundays.

The nearest noise sensitive land use (hotel) to the project site property line is greater than 200 feet to the west. The loudest piece of construction equipment would be a breaker (if used) that has noise level of 90 dBA L<sub>MAX</sub> at 50 feet. Based on a source-to-receiver sound attenuation factor of approximately six dB per doubling of distance, project construction would not exceed the 75 dBA threshold at the closest noise sensitive land use. Therefore, construction activities would comply with the City Noise Ordinance (SDMC Section 59.5.0401).

The City Noise Ordinance also sets limits for operational noise generation, as measured at the property line. For the project's land use, the applicable noise standard would be 75 dBA  $L_{EQ}$ . Operational noise would be similar to the existing uses and include heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) units.

Additionally, vehicle related noise would occur from employee and delivery truck trips. To generate a noticeable increase in noise levels, traffic volumes generated by a project would generally have to double existing conditions. Given that the project is proposing no increase in development intensity in relation to what is currently entitled and no substantial increase in employees, traffic volumes associated with the project would not sufficiently raise the volume of traffic to create a significant change in noise levels. Likewise, given that the site land uses are currently used for similar R&D land uses, the project would have similar operational noise impacts as presently exist at the site.

The project would result in a continuation of similar activities occurring at the site and be within the parameters of the types of actions envisioned to occur with implementation of the approved projects. Therefore, this change would not result in additional noise impacts beyond those identified in the prior environmental documents. The revised project would not change the previous findings with respect to noise.

Based on the foregoing analysis and information, there is no evidence that implementation of the project would require a major change to the conclusions in the prior environmental documents. The project would not result in any new significant impacts nor a substantial increase in the severity of impacts from that described in the previously certified SEIR and adopted MNDs.

### Paleontological Resources

#### 1993 EIR

The 1993 SEIR did not address Paleontological Resources.

### 2005 MND 6655

Because the max cut depth with this project was eight feet, the 2005 MND 6655 found no impact associated with Paleontological Resources.

#### 2005 MND 5844

Due to the large amount of cut proposed and excavations to a depth of approximately 35 feet to construct the two levels of subterranean parking, the 2005 MND 5844 found impacts to Paleontological Resources to be significant and mitigation was required. With mitigation requiring monitoring of areas that involve trenching or cutting, impacts were found to be less than significant.

### **Proposed Project**

Implementation of the project would occur within the same parcels evaluated in the prior environmental documents. Project grading would include 183,150 CY of cut and 5,200 CY of fill, primarily to accommodate the subterranean parking structure. Similar to the 2005 MND 5844, without mitigation there is the potential to impact paleontological resources. In accordance with the City's CEQA Thresholds, a significant Impact could occur in formations with a moderate sensitivity rating if grading would exceed 2,000 CY and at a depth of 10 feet or more. Grading of the site would exceed 2,000 CY and would occur at depths greater than 10 feet.

In addition, the UCP states that although many areas within the UCP area with a moderate to high potential for fossil remains coincide with designated open space, resources may be lost by grading activities associated with development. While the project is occurring in an area that is previously disturbed and developed, there is the potential that deeper excavations into formations that have moderate paleontological sensitivity may unearth unknown resources. In accordance with SDMC Section 142.0151 (Paleontological Resources Requirements for Grading Activities), the project would require paleontological monitoring during grading and/or excavation activities as outlined in the City's Land Development Manual Appendix P, General Grading Guidelines for Paleontological Resources.

The project would result in a continuation of similar activities occurring at the site and be within the parameters of the types of actions envisioned to occur with implementation of the approved projects. Therefore, this change would not result in additional impacts on paleontological resources beyond those identified in the prior environmental documents The revised project would not change the previous findings with respect to paleontological resources impacts.

Based on the foregoing analysis and information, there is no evidence that implementation of the project would require a major change to the conclusions in the prior environmental documents. The project would not result in any new significant impacts nor a substantial increase in the severity of impacts from that described in the previously certified SEIR and adopted MNDs.

### **Population and Housing**

### 1993 EIR

The 1993 SEIR determined that no significant adverse effects were identified in relation to Population or Housing. Specifically, the proposed project would not alter the planned location, distribution, density, or growth rate of the population of an area, and it would not affect existing housing in the community or create a demand for additional housing.

#### 2005 MND 6655

The 2005 MND 6655 found that the proposed project would not induce population growth, was consistent with the existing UCP population projections, and would not displace any housing.

#### 2005 MND 5844

The 2005 MND 5844 found that the proposed project would not induce population growth, was consistent with the existing UCP population projections, and would not displace any housing.

### **Proposed Project**

Implementation of the project would occur within the same parcels evaluated in the prior environmental documents. The proposed project does not include housing that would directly induce population growth. The project would provide employment opportunities through the development of 428,160 GFA of building space. It is possible that a percentage of employees relocate to the area, but such numbers would not be substantial so as to adversely affect existing and future housing stock in the community. In relation to the approved projects, the proposed project would result in an equal amount of building space and is projected to employ 1,250 people (as opposed to 1,242 associated with the approved projects). Thus, while new employment opportunities may occur in conjunction with the project, these opportunities have already been accounted for and analyzed as part of the previous entitlements. Moreover, given that the project is consistent with the land use designation and zoning, any population growth associated with such uses has been accounted for in regional planning. Thus, any incremental population growth as a result of project-related employment opportunities could be accommodated by the current and future housing stock. Additionally, the project does not include the extension or construction of any roadways or other infrastructure that could indirectly foster future population growth.

Moreover, the project site currently supports four R&D buildings, two of which would be demolished to accommodate the proposed project. Thus, the proposed project would not displace existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. Moreover, the project site is not designated or zoned for residential land uses and therefore, project implementation would not remove land assigned for this purpose thereby indirectly resulting in the need for housing elsewhere.

The project would result in a continuation of similar activities occurring at the site and be within the parameters of the types of actions envisioned to occur with implementation of the approved projects. Therefore, this change would not result in additional impacts on population and housing

beyond those identified in the prior environmental documents. The revised project would not change the previous findings with respect to impacts on population and housing.

Based on the foregoing analysis and information, there is no evidence that implementation of the project would require a major change to the conclusions in the prior environmental documents. The project would not result in any new significant impacts nor a substantial increase in the severity of impacts from that described in the previously certified SEIR and adopted MNDs.

### **Public Services**

#### 1993 EIR

The 1993 SEIR determined that no significant adverse effects were identified in relation to Public Services. Specifically, the site is served by all urban services and utilities, including water, sewer, electricity, and fire and police protection, which have sufficient capacity to meet anticipated project demands. The incremental service demands that this project represents would not result in a need for new or altered governmental services.

### 2005 MND 6655

The 2005 MND 6655 found that because the project was located in an existing industrial complex with public services already being provided, no impact to public services would occur.

### 2005 MND 5844

The 2005 MND 5844 found that because the project was located in an existing industrial complex the project would not be expected to require more resources than currently available and serving the site.

### **Proposed Project**

Implementation of the project would occur within the same parcels evaluated in the prior environmental documents. The project site is currently developed and located in an urbanized area where public services are already provided. The project would be consistent with the General Plan, UCP, and zoning. Further, the project would not increase the density of building space in relation to what is entitled under existing development permits. Therefore, the project would not adversely affect existing levels of public services to the area, substantially increase the need for new staff or require the construction of new or expanded governmental facilities to serve the project. In addition, the project would be required to pay development impact fees as applicable.

The project would result in a continuation of similar activities occurring at the site and be within the parameters of the types of actions envisioned to occur with implementation of the approved projects. Therefore, this change would not result in additional impacts upon public services beyond those identified in the prior environmental documents. The revised project would not change the previous findings with respect to impacts on public services.

Based on the foregoing analysis and information, there is no evidence that implementation of the project would require a major change to the conclusions in the prior environmental documents. The

project would not result in any new significant impacts nor a substantial increase in the severity of impacts from that described in the previously certified SEIR and adopted MNDs.

### **Recreational Resources**

### 1993 EIR

The 1993 SEIR determined that no significant adverse effects were identified in relation to Recreational Resources. Specifically, that the proposed project would not affect the quality or quantity of existing recreational opportunities.

### 2005 MND 6655

The 2005 MND 6655 found that the project would not affect any parks or recreational facilities.

### 2005 MND 5844

The 2005 MND 5844 found that the project would not affect any parks or recreational facilities.

### **Proposed Project**

Implementation of the project would occur within the same parcels evaluated in the prior environmental documents. The project consists of construction of structures that would house R&D and associated facilities and an amenities village that would serve onsite employees. In addition, the development intensity of building space would not increase in relation to what is entitled under existing permits. As discussed above, the project would not induce growth that would substantially increase the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities. The project is not anticipated to result in the use of available parks or facilities such that substantial deterioration occurs, or that would require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities to satisfy demand.

The project would result in a continuation of similar activities occurring at the site and be within the parameters of the types of actions envisioned to occur with implementation of the approved projects. Therefore, this change would not result in additional recreational impacts beyond those identified in the prior environmental documents. The revised project would not change the previous findings with respect to recreation impacts.

Based on the foregoing analysis and information, there is no evidence that implementation of the project would require a major change to the conclusions in the prior environmental documents. The project would not result in any new significant impacts nor a substantial increase in the severity of impacts from that described in the previously certified SEIR and adopted MNDs.

# **Water Conservation**

### 1993 EIR

The 1993 SEIR determined that no significant adverse effects were identified in relation to Water Conservation. Specifically, the landscaping plan for the proposed project identified predominantly

drought-tolerant erosion control plantings; consequently, excessive amounts of water would not be required.

### 2005 MND 6655

The 2005 MND 6655 found that the project would comply with the City's Landscaping Regulations and would not use excessive amounts of water.

### 2005 MND 5844

The 2005 MND 5844 found that the project would comply with the City's Landscaping Regulations and would not use excessive amounts of water.

### **Proposed Project**

Implementation of the project would occur within the same parcels evaluated in the prior environmental documents. The existing project site currently receives water service from the City, and adequate services are available to serve the project without requiring new or expanded entitlements. As required under the Urban Water Management Planning Act and the California Water Code, the City prepared the 2015 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) that examines the reliability of the water supply during normal, dry, and multiple drought years and provides a foundation for water supply planning. The analysis conducted for the UWMP concluded that under all scenarios that the combination of wholesale water and water supplies will be sufficient to meet water demands. Further, to formulate the forecast demands that are used in determining the sufficiency of water supply in future years, the UWMP relies in part on land use development in accordance with general land use plans. The proposed project is consistent with the City's General Plan and the UCP. As such, adequate water supplies would be available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years. Moreover, the proposed project would not increase the amount of building space as is already entitled under approved development permits and therefore, water use would be similar. Additionally, the project does not meet the thresholds requiring the need for the project to prepare a water supply assessment.

As identified in the CAP Checklist prepared for the project, the project structures would be provided with plumbing fixtures and fittings that do not exceed CALGreen maximum flow rate and requirements related to the specified flow rates will be included in the lease letters for all buildings to ensure that future replacement fixtures meet or exceed these requirements. Lastly, as with the approved projects the proposed project would comply with the City's Landscaping Regulations.

The project would result in a continuation of similar activities occurring at the site and be within the parameters of the types of actions envisioned to occur with implementation of the approved projects. Therefore, this change would not result in additional impacts to water conservation beyond those identified in the prior environmental documents. The revised project would not change the previous findings with respect to water conservation.

Based on the foregoing analysis and information, there is no evidence that implementation of the project would require a major change to the conclusions in the prior environmental documents. The
project would not result in any new significant impacts nor a substantial increase in the severity of impacts from that described in the previously certified SEIR and adopted MNDs.

# Utilities

## 1993 EIR

The 1993 SEIR determined that no significant adverse effects were identified in relation to Utilities. Specifically, the existing utilities would be adequate for the requirements of the proposed project, no new systems, or substantial alterations would be required.

# 2005 MND 6655

The 2005 MND 6655 found that current utilities serving the project site were sufficient and there would be no need for new systems or a substantial increase in existing systems.

#### 2005 MND 5844

The 2005 MND 5844 found that current utilities serving the project site were sufficient and there would be no need for new systems or a substantial increase in existing systems.

## **Proposed Project**

Implementation of the project would occur within the same parcels evaluated in the prior environmental documents. Under current permits, the project site is entitled to construct a total of 428,160 SF of building space, equal to that of the proposed project. A sewer study prepared for the proposed project indicates that the existing infrastructure has enough capacity to serve the proposed development without any negative impacts to the public sewer system (Rick Engineering 2021).

Water service is provided by the City Public Utilities Department. The proposed project would not increase the amount of buildable space in relation to the existing entitlements, therefore the project would not substantially increase the demand for water services.

Post-project runoff will be treated via a network of storm water management features, designed pursuant to the guidelines of the City's Storm Water Standards. According to the Drainage Study prepared for the proposed project, since the project has been designed to improve the collection and conveyance of storm water runoff within the project boundaries and the difference in the preand detained post project 100-year peak flow (less than 1 cubic foot per second) is minimal, the project is not anticipated to result in any adverse impacts to downstream drainage facilities or adjacent properties (Rick Engineering 2021).

A Waste Management Plan (WMP) was prepared for the proposed project to identify the quantity of solid waste that would be generated by the proposed project throughout demolition, construction, and operation, and to identify measures to reduce the potential impacts associated with management of such waste.

During pre-construction demolition, clearing/grubbing, and grading, the project would produce 271,609 tons of excavated soils, green waste, asphalt/concrete, and other construction and debris

(C&D) waste, and divert 267,884 tons of these materials from the landfill. Approximately 3,725 tons of solid waste material generated during pre-construction is anticipated to be disposed of as non-recyclable/non-reusable waste at Miramar Landfill, for an overall pre-construction diversion rate of 99 percent.

During construction, the project would produce approximately 673 tons of solid waste (metal, concrete, concrete/steel, asphalt, brick/masonry, wood, drywall, carpet/carpet padding, mixed debris, and trash), and divert 549 tons of solid waste materials from the landfill. The diverted material would consist of clean, source-separated (segregated) recyclable and/or reusable material, as well as mixed debris, to be deposited at the recycling/reuse facilities identified in the City's Certified C&D Recycling Facility Directory. Approximately 124 tons of solid waste material generated during construction is anticipated to be disposed of as non-recyclable/non-reusable waste at Miramar Landfill, for an overall diversion rate during construction of approximately 82 percent.

With the combined pre-construction and construction phases, the project would produce 272,282 tons of solid waste and would divert 268,433 tons. This would be an overall diversion rate during pre-construction and construction of 99 percent.

During occupancy, it has been estimated that the project would generate an additional 373 tons of waste per year over existing conditions, of which 149 tons per year would be diverted to recycling/reuse facilities, resulting in an estimated 40 percent diversion of waste from the landfill. These materials would consist of clean, recyclable materials, gathered in on site recycling bins. An additional 224 tons per year, or 60 percent of occupancy material generated, are estimated to be disposed of as non-recyclable/non-reusable waste at Miramar Landfill.

Based on the quantified waste generation and diversion rates discussed above, the project would exceed the 75 percent solid waste diversion rate for waste produced during the pre-construction and construction phases. The project would fail to meet the 75 percent waste reduction target annually once the buildings are occupied. This shortcoming is overcome by the following factors:

- The segregation proposed during pre-construction and construction would achieve an overall 99 percent diversion rate, exceeding the 75 percent target.
- To further reduce solid waste impacts, as a condition of approval the project would incorporate mandatory waste reduction, recycling, and diversion measures during pre-construction and construction as identified in the WMP.
- Ongoing diversion of green waste (landscaping debris) to Miramar Greenery would avoid unnecessary contributions to Miramar Landfill.
- To minimize generation of waste materials, the project would incorporate recycled, post-consumer content materials in interiors and exteriors, to the extent practicable.

In addition to these measures implemented during pre-construction and construction activities, as a condition of approval the applicant would commit to the recycling requirements, to further reduce solid waste impacts during occupancy:

The applicant shall undertake and/or shall specify in contract language and/or sales/lease agreements with any tenant, operator, and/or future owner, a list of recycling requirements with which the applicant or future tenants, operators, and/or owners shall be obligated to comply, including, but not limited to, the following:

- Recycling areas shall be clearly identified with large signs.
- Lists of acceptable and unacceptable materials shall be posted on recycling bins.
- All recycled material signage shall be visible on at least two sides of recycling containers.
- Recycling bins shall be placed in areas that would be readily accessible and would minimize misuse or contamination.
- Prepare and distribute recycling educational materials for inspection by Environmental Services Department prior to certificate of occupancy.
- After materials are approved, distribute to all project site owners/occupants.
- Green waste generated by ongoing landscaping and landscape maintenance activities shall be source separated by the landscaping contractor and diverted to Miramar Greenery.

Prior to issuance of any certificate of occupancy/tentative certificate of occupancy, the applicant shall invite a representative of the City Environmental Services Department to:

- Inspect and approve storage areas that have been provided consistent with the City's Storage Ordinance;
- Ensure that a hauler has been retained to provide recyclable materials collection, and, if applicable, landscape waste collection;
- Ensure that a hauler will provide a green bin for organic waste disposal starting on or before January 1, 2022; and
- Inspect and approve education materials for building tenants/owners that are required pursuant to the City's Recycling Ordinance.

For specialized product purchasing (e.g., with recycled content) to be used during occupancy, the Applicant shall provide for inspection by Environmental Services Department the documentation that would be used to carry out this requirement.

The project would result in a continuation of similar activities occurring at the site and be within the parameters of the types of actions envisioned to occur with implementation of the approved projects. Therefore, this change would not result in additional impacts upon utility services beyond those identified in the prior environmental documents. The revised project would not change the previous findings with respect to impacts on utility services.

There is no new information, such as new regulations, a change of circumstances, or changes to the project, that would give rise to new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the

severity of previously identified significant effects. This analysis does not result in different conclusions than those reached in the prior environmental documents related to utility services, either on a project-related or cumulative basis. No new mitigation measures are required.

Based on the foregoing analysis and information, there is no evidence that implementation of the project would require a major change to the conclusions in the prior environmental documents. The project would not result in any new significant impacts nor a substantial increase in the severity of impacts from that described in the previously certified SEIR and adopted MNDs.

# VI. Issues Not Analyzed in the Previous Documents

# **Greenhouse Gas Emissions**

The generation of GHG emissions was not discussed in the certified SEIR or adopted MNDs because such analysis was not required at the time of the preparation of the environmental documents. Currently the CEQA Guidelines Appendix G requires a discussion in relation to whether a project would, either directly or indirectly, generate GHG emissions and/or or conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions GHG.

The following discussion provides information to show that while GHG not analyzed, there is no new information available that would indicate that these issues would result in a new significant impact.

The City's adopted CAP aims to reduce emissions 40 percent below the baseline to approximately 7.8 million metric tons (MMT) of carbon dioxide equivalent ( $CO_2e$ ) by 2030, and 50 percent below the baseline to approximately 6.5 MMT  $CO_2e$  by 2035. The City has identified the following five CAP strategies to reduce GHG emissions to achieve the 2020 and 2035 targets: (1) energy- and water-efficient buildings; (2) clean and renewable energy; (3) bicycling, walking, transit, and land use; (4) zero waste (gas and waste management); and (5) climate resiliency.

The City's CAP Consistency Checklist, is the primary document used by the City to ensure project-byproject consistency with the underlying assumptions in the CAP and thereby to ensure that the City would achieve the emission reduction targets identified in its CAP. The CAP Consistency Checklist includes a three-step process to determine if the 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 design features compliance with the CAP strategies. Step 3 is only applicable if a project is not consistent with the land use and/or zone, but is also in a transit priority area to allow for more intensive development than assumed in the CAP.

The project completed a CAP Checklist. Under Step 1 of the CAP Consistency Checklist, the project is consistent with the existing General Plan and Community Plan designations for the site. The project site has a land use designation of Industrial Employment in the UCP and is zoned as IP 1-1. Consistent with this designation and zoning, the project proposes a development that would support R&D and supportive land uses. Therefore, the project is consistent with the growth projections and land use assumptions used in the CAP.

Furthermore, completion of Step 2 of the CAP Consistency Checklist demonstrates that the project would be consistent with applicable strategies and actions for reducing GHG emissions. This

includes project features such as, 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. Step 3 of the CAP Consistency Checklist would not be applicable, as the project is not proposing a land use plan amendment or a rezone. Therefore, the project would be consistent with the CAP and would result in a less than significant impact on the environment with respect to GHG emissions.

Although the generation of GHG emissions was not discussed in the prior environmental documents there is no new information that would give rise to new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects, either on a project-related or cumulative basis. No new mitigation measures are required.

## **Other Issues**

California Environmental Quality Act (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 an EIR. The certified SEIR determined that impacts related to Geology/Soils, Noise, Light, Glare, and Shading, Natural Resources, Recreational Resources, Recreational Resources Population, Housing, Public Services, Utilities, Energy, and Water Conservation to not to be significant. However, these issues are evaluated within this Addendum as they were addressed in more detail in the 2005 MND 6655 and the 2005 MND 5844 subsequent to the SEIR.

# VII. Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Program (MMRP) Incorporated Into The Project

- A. GENERAL REQUIREMENTS PART I Plan Check Phase (prior to permit issuance)
  - Prior to the issuance of any construction permits, such as Demolition, Grading or Building, or beginning any construction-related activity on-site, the Development Services Department (DSD) Director's Environmental Designee (ED) shall review and approve all Construction Documents (CD), (plans, specification, details, etc.) to ensure the MMRP requirements are incorporated into the design.
  - 2. In addition, the ED shall verify that the MMRP Conditions/Notes that apply ONLY to the construction phases of this project are included VERBATIM, under the heading, "ENVIRONMENTAL/MITIGATION REQUIREMENTS."
  - 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: <u>http://www.sandiego.gov/developmentservices/industry/information/standtemp</u>
  - 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)
  - PRE-CONSTRUCTION MEETING is required ten (10) working days prior to beginning any work on this project. the permit holder/owner is responsible to arrange and perform this meeting by contacting the city resident engineer (RE) of the field engineering division and city staff from mitigation monitoring coordination (MMC). attendees must also include the permit holder's representative(s), job site superintendent, and the following consultant:

Qualified Paleontological Monitor, Qualified Biologist, Acoustician

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, applicant is also required to call RE and MMC at 858-627-3360
- 2. MMRP COMPLIANCE: This Project, Project Tracking System (PTS) Number 660043 and/or Environmental Document Number 660043, 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.

- National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Municipal Storm Water Permit Compliance;
- NPDES General Construction Activity Permit for Storm Water Discharges Compliance;
- 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 would be performed. When necessary for clarification, a detailed methodology of how the work would 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	Biologist Limit of Work Verification	Limit of Work Inspection
Historic (Archaeology)	Archaeological Reports	Archeological Monitoring
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

The project shall be required to comply with applicable mitigation measures outlined within the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) of the 1993 SEIR and 2005 MND and those identified with the project-specific subsequent technical studies. The following MMRP identifies measures that specifically apply to this project.

# <u>Biological Resources (Offsite Conservation and Upland Impacts/Southern maritime</u> <u>chaparral)</u>

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 preconstruction meeting, whichever is applicable, the owner/permitee shall convey a Covenant of Easement for the 3.2-acre offsite mitigation area located at 3050 Callan Road (APN 340-010-4500) comprised of 1.6 acres of Tier I southern maritime Chaparral and 0.4 acre of Tier II Diegan coastal sage scrub-acre. The offsite preservation site shall mitigate a total of 0.4 Tier I southern maritime chaparral outside of the MHPA at a 2:1 ratio in accordance with the City's Biology Guidelines for direct impacts.

The remaining 1.2 acres of southern maritime chaparral and 0.4 acre of Diegan coastal sage scrub shall remain available for future mitigation associated only with Alexandria Real Estate development projects, and subject to City review and approval (DSD and MSCP) on a project-by-project basis.

# APN 340-010-4500; Callan Road mitigation site

# **Biological Resources (Wart-stemmed Ceanothus)**

The project shall avoid and continued on-site preservation of 24 wart-stemmed ceanothus shrubs within the on-site open space parcel and shall preserve an additional 23 wart-stemmed ceanothus shrubs within the off-site Callan Road mitigation site for a total of 47 preserved wart-stemmed ceanothus shrubs.

# Historical Resources (Archaeological Data Recovery Program)

Prior to issuance of any construction permits, including but not limited to, the first Grading Permit, Demolition Plans/Permits and Building Plans/Permits, but prior to the first preconstruction meeting, whichever is applicable, the Owner/Permittee shall ensure that the following mitigation measures are outlined verbatim on appropriate construction plans.

The project shall require implementation of an Archaeological Data Recovery Program (ADRP) to mitigate impacts to archaeological site (P-37-012581) prior to the issuance of ANY construction permits or the start of ANY construction if no permits are required. The ADRP with Native American participation consists of a Statistical Sample and shall be implemented as described below after consultation with DSD Environmental Designee in accordance with the One Alexandria Square Project Cultural Resources Study prepared by HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc., dated December 2021.

1. Prior to the start fieldwork, a thorough review of the mapping of soil groups and artifact recovery from the 1992 testing program, to guide placement of initial excavation units;

- 2. Monitoring by an archaeologist and a Kumeyaay Native American monitor of removal of the existing asphalt/hardscape within the encroachment area in preparation for the data recovery excavation;
- 3. Excavation of an initial 2.5 percent sample of the portion of P-37-012581 within the development footprint; that is, 55 1-meter-by-1-meter excavation units (or the equivalent thereof), to identify intact deposits/cultural features and to provide a representative sample of cultural material present at the site;
- 4. Block excavation to expose cultural features, if such features are encountered; block excavation shall be part of the initial 2.5 percent sample;
- 5. Based on the quantities and types of cultural material recovered in the original 2.5 percent sample and the finding of cultural features, additional excavation may be recommended, to be determined through discussion with City staff (MMC) and the Kumeyaay Native American representative for the project. The additional sample size shall be dependent upon the nature and amount of cultural material recovered and is expected to be an additional 2.5 percent sample;
- Screening of all excavated soil, using 1/8-inch mesh screen;
- Stockpiling of screened soil from each excavation unit; so that in the event that potential human remains are identified, soils from the unit in which such remains were identified can be water-screened;
- 8. Cleaning, sorting, cataloging, and analysis of all cultural material collected;
- 9. Analysis of faunal material recovered;
- 10. Analysis of flaked stone and ground stone tools;
- 11. Detailed analysis of a sample of debitage collected;
- 12. Obsidian sourcing and hydration analysis on a sample of artifacts, as appropriate;
- 13. Other lithic raw material sourcing on a sample of artifacts, as appropriate;
- 14. Radiocarbon analysis;
- 15. Other special studies, such as protein residue analysis, as applicable;
- Preparation of a comprehensive report detailing the methods and results of the data recovery program;
- 17. Curation of the cultural material collected during the data recovery program, as well as collections from previous studies by RECON and Affinis, at the San Diego Archaeological Center or other suitable repository meeting state and/or federal curatorial standards.

# Historical Resources (Archaeological and Native American Monitoring)

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

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

#### **III. During Construction**

- A. Monitor(s) Shall be Present During Grading/Excavation/Trenching
  - 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 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.
  - No soil shall be exported off-site until a determination can be made regarding the significance of the resource specifically if Native American resources are encountered.
- C. Determination of Significance
  - 1. The PI and Native American consultant/monitor, where Native American resources are discovered shall evaluate the significance of the resource. If Human Remains are involved, follow protocol in Section IV below.

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

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

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

## A. Notification

- 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

- Work shall be directed away from the location of the discovery and any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlay adjacent human remains until a determination can be made by the Medical Examiner in consultation with the PI concerning the provenance of the remains.
- 2. The Medical Examiner, in consultation with the PI, will determine the need for a field examination to determine the provenance.

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

other information required by PRC 5097.98. The document shall be indexed as a notice under the name of the owner.

# V. Night and/or Weekend Work

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

## **VI. Post Construction**

- A. Preparation and Submittal of Draft Monitoring Report
  - The PI shall submit two copies of the Draft Monitoring Report (even if negative), prepared in accordance with the Historical Resources Guidelines (Appendix C/D) which describes the results, analysis, and conclusions of all phases of the Archaeological Monitoring Program (with appropriate graphics) to MMC for review and approval within 90 days following the completion of

monitoring. It should be noted that if the PI is unable to submit the Draft Monitoring Report within the allotted 90-day timeframe resulting from delays with analysis, special study results or other complex issues, a schedule shall be submitted to MMC establishing agreed due dates and the provision for submittal of monthly status reports until this measure can be met.

- a. For significant archaeological resources encountered during monitoring, the Archaeological Data Recovery Program shall be included in the Draft Monitoring Report.
- b. Recording Sites with State of California Department of Parks and Recreation

The PI shall be responsible for recording (on the appropriate State of California Department of Park and Recreation forms-DPR 523 A/B) any significant or potentially significant resources encountered during the Archaeological Monitoring Program in accordance with the City's Historical Resources Guidelines, and submittal of such forms to the South Coastal Information Center with the Final Monitoring Report.

- MMC shall return the Draft Monitoring Report to the PI for revision or, for preparation of the Final Report.
- 3. The PI shall submit revised Draft Monitoring Report to MMC for approval.
- 4. MMC shall provide written verification to the PI of the approved report.
- 5. MMC shall notify the RE or BI, as appropriate, of receipt of all Draft Monitoring Report submittals and approvals.
- B. Handling of Artifacts
  - 1. The PI shall be responsible for ensuring that all cultural remains collected are cleaned and catalogued
  - The PI shall be responsible for ensuring that all artifacts are analyzed to identify function and chronology as they relate to the history of the area; that faunal material is identified as to species; and that specialty studies are completed, as appropriate.
  - 3. The cost for curation is the responsibility of the property owner.
- C. Curation of artifacts: Accession Agreement and Acceptance Verification
  - 1. The PI shall be responsible for ensuring that all artifacts associated with the survey, testing and/or data recovery for this project are permanently curated with an appropriate institution. This shall be completed in consultation with MMC and the Native American representative, as applicable.

- 2. The PI shall include the Acceptance Verification from the curation institution in the Final Monitoring Report submitted to the RE or BI and MMC.
- 3. When applicable to the situation, the PI shall include written verification from the Native American consultant/monitor indicating that Native American resources were treated in accordance with state law and/or applicable agreements. If the resources were reinterred, verification shall be provided to show what protective measures were taken to ensure no further disturbance occurs in accordance with Section IV – Discovery of Human Remains, Subsection 5.
- D. Final Monitoring Report(s)
  - 1. The PI shall submit one copy of the approved Final Monitoring Report to the RE or BI as appropriate, and one copy to MMC (even if negative), within 90 days after notification from MMC that the draft report has been approved.
  - The RE shall, in no case, issue the Notice of Completion and/or release of the Performance Bond for grading until receiving a copy of the approved Final Monitoring Report from MMC which includes the Acceptance Verification from the curation institution.

# VIII. Significant Unmitigated Impacts

The 1993 Calbiochem-Balit U.S. Holding SEIR (SCH No. 89071907) indicated that there would be significant and unavoidable impacts associated with Aesthetics/Visual Quality, Hydrology/Water Quality, Land Use, and Transportation/Circulation.

Additional environmental documentation (2005 Alexandria Technology Center – Science Park Mitigated Negative Declaration 6655 and 2005 Torrey Pines Science Park MND 5844) identified no significant unavoidable impacts. Specifically, the 2005 Alexandria Technology Center – Science Park Mitigated Negative Declaration 6655 identified significant but mitigated impacts to Historical Resources (Archaeology), and all other issues were determined to either be less than significant or no impact would occur.

The 2005 Torrey Pines Science Park MND 5844 found significant but mitigated impacts to Biology, Historical Resources (Archaeology), and Paleontology. This MND found less than significant impacts to Water Quality. All other issue areas were found to have no impact or less than significant impacts.

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 1989 EIR and 1993 SEIR, 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 proposed 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 prior environmental documents.

# IX. Certification

Copies of the addendum, prior environmental documents, the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, and associated project-specific technical appendices, if any, may be accessed on the City's CEQA webpage at <u>www.sandiego.gov/ceqa/final</u>.

E. Shearer-Nguyen, Program Manager Development Services Department April 14, 2022 Date of Final Report

Analyst: Shearer-Nguyen

Attachments:

Figure 1: Site Plan Figure 2: Aerial Photograph Figure 3: Regional Context

# References

California Department of Conservation.

2021. California Important Farmland Finder. Available at: <u>https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/ciff/</u>.

California Department of Toxic Substances Control 2022. EnviroStor. Available at: <u>https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/</u>

California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)

2021. California State Scenic Highway System Map. Available at: https://caltrans.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=465dfd3d807c46cc8e8 057116f1aacaa

California State Water Resources Control Board 2022. GeoTracker Database. Available at: <u>https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/</u>

## Geocon

2021. Geotechnical Investigation. September.

HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc.

2022. One Alexandria Square Project Air Quality Technical Report. February.

2022. One Alexandria Square Biological Resources Technical Report. February.

2022. One Alexandria Square Biological Resources Technical Report. February.

2022. City of San Diego Climate Action Plan Consistency Checklist. January.

2021. One Alexandria Square Project Cultural Resources Study. December.

**Rick Engineering** 

2022. One Alexandria Square Local Mobility Analysis. January.

2022. One Alexandria Square Mobility Choices Consistency Analysis. January.

San Diego, City of.

2008. The City of San Diego General Plan. March.

2007. Final Program Environmental Impact Report for the City of San Diego General Plan. September.

2005. Mitigated Negative Declaration No 5844 for the Torrey Pines Science Park, December.

2005. Mitigated Negative Declaration No. 6655 for the Alexandria Technology Center – Science Park, April.

1993. Supplemental Environmental Impact Report No. 89-0928 for the Calbiochem-Balit U.S. Holding.

1989. Environmental Impact Report No. 89-0702 for the Calbiochem Community Plan Amendment. This page intentionally left blank

.





# Site Plan

One Alexandria Square



350 Feet \_



**Aerial Photograph** 

One Alexandria Square



Source: Aerial (NearMap, 2019)



n

**Regional Context** 

One Alexandria Square



350 Feet \_



**Aerial Photograph** 

One Alexandria Square



Source: Aerial (NearMap, 2019)



n

**Regional Context**