



THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO

MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Project No. 654348

SCH No. TBD

SUBJECT: **Southwest Neighborhood Park:** The project proposes to construct an 11.53-acre community park with various amenities, two surface parking lots with 53 parking spaces. Additional improvements would include paved walking paths and accessible ramps, security lighting, storm water treatment basins, and associated landscaping. The vacant 11.53-acre project site is located at 1305 25th Street and 1362 27th Street. The site is designated Park and zoned RS-1-7 per the Otay Mesa-Nestor Community Plan. Additionally, the project site is within the Airport Land Use Compatibility Overlay Zone (Brown Field), the Airport Influence Area (Brown Field- Review Area 2), the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Part 77 Noticing Area for Naval Outlying Landing Field-Imperial Beach, the Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone, the Parking Standards Transit Priority Area, and the Transit Priority Area. (Legal Description: Portion of Lot 145 of Tibbitt's Tract, Being a subdivision of the South ½ of the Southwest ¼ of Sec. 27 and the N. ½ of the Northwest ¼ of Sec. 34, All in T.18S, R.2. West San Bernardino Meridian, County of San Diego, State of California, according to the Amended Map thereof being licensed survey Map 24, filed in the office of the County Recorder of San Diego County November 25, 1892.) APPLICANT: City of San Diego Engineering and Capital Projects Department.

I. PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

See attached Initial Study.

II. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING:

See attached Initial Study.

III. DETERMINATION:

The City of San Diego conducted an Initial Study which determined that the proposed project could have a significant environmental effect in the following areas(s): **Biological Resources, Historical Resources (Archaeology), and Tribal Cultural Resources.** Subsequent revisions in the project proposal create the specific mitigation identified in Section V of this Mitigated Negative Declaration. The project as revised now avoids or

mitigates the potentially significant environmental effects previously identified, and the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report will not be required.

IV. DOCUMENTATION:

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

V. MITIGATION, MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM:

A. General Requirements – Part I

Plan Check Phase

1. Prior to Bid Opening/Bid Award 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, specifications, details, etc.) to ensure MMRP requirements have been incorporated.
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:

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

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

B. GENERAL REQUIREMENTS – PART II

Post Plan Check (Prior to start of construction)

PRE-CONSTRUCTION MEETING IS REQUIRED TEN (10) WORKING DAYS PRIOR TO BEGINNING ANY WORK ON THIS PROJECT. The City Project Manager (PM) of the Engineering and Capital Projects Department 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 following consultants as necessary: **Biologist, Archaeologist and Native American Monitor**

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

CONTACT INFORMATION:

- a) The PRIMARY POINT OF CONTACT is the **PM** at the **Field Engineering Division** (858) 627-3200
- b) For clarification of ENVIRONMENTAL REQUIREMENTS, it is also required to call **RE and MMC at (858) 627-3360**

1. **MMRP COMPLIANCE:** This project, Project Tracking System (PTS) No. 654348, or for subsequent future projects the associated PTS No. 654348 shall conform to the mitigation requirements contained in the associated Environmental Document and implemented to the satisfaction of the DSD's ED, MMC and the Engineering and Capital Projects Department. 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, and methodology, etc).

Note: The PM 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.

2. **OTHER AGENCY REQUIREMENTS:** Evidence that any other agency requirements or permits have been obtained or are in process 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 as applicable: **Not Applicable.**
3. **MONITORING EXHIBITS:** All consultants are required to submit to RE and MMC, a monitoring exhibit on a 11 x 17 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 indicated when in the construction schedule that work will be performed. When necessary for clarification, a detailed methodology of how the work will be performed shall be included.
4. **OTHER SUBMITTALS AND INSPECTIONS:** The PM of the Engineering and Capital Projects Department shall submit all required documentation, verification letters, and requests for all associated inspections to the RE and MMC for approval per the following schedule:

DOCUMENT SUBMITTAL/INSPECTION CHECKLIST		
Issue Area	Document Submittal	Associated Inspection/Approvals/Notes
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
Biology	Biology Reports	Biology/Habitat Restoration Inspection
Archaeology	Archaeology Reports	Archaeology/Historic Site Observation
Tribal Cultural Resources	Archaeology Reports	Archaeology/Historic Site Observation

SPECIFIC MMRP ISSUE AREA CONDITIONS/REQUIREMENTS:

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Prior to permit issuance or Bid Opening/Bid Award, whichever is applicable, the applicant shall make payment to the City of San Diego (City) Habitat Acquisition Fund (HAF) to mitigate for the loss of 6.36 acres of non-native grasslands (Tier IIIB). This fee is based on mitigation ratios, per the City of San Diego Biology Guidelines, of 0.5:1 ratio if mitigation would occur inside of the Multi-habitat Planning Area (MHPA) and a 1:1 ratio should mitigation occur outside of the MHPA. Therefore, the resulting total mitigation required for direct project impacts to non-native grasslands would be 3.18 acre inside the MHPA or 6.36 acres outside the MHPA equivalent contribution to the City's HAF plus a 10 percent administrative fee.

HISTORICAL RESOURCES (ARCHAEOLOGY)

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

A. Entitlements Plan Check

1. Prior to permit issuance or Bid Opening/Bid Award, whichever is applicable, the Environmental Designee (ED) of the Engineering and Capital Projects Department 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 ED

1. Prior to Bid Award, the Engineering and Capital Projects Department 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 Historical Resources Guidelines (HRG). If applicable, individuals involved in the archaeological monitoring program must have completed the 40-hour HAZWOPER training with certification documentation.

2. MMC will provide a letter to the applicant confirming the qualifications of the PI and all persons involved in the archaeological monitoring of the project meet the qualifications established in the HRG.
3. Prior to the start of work, the applicant must obtain written approval from MMC for any personnel changes associated with the monitoring program.

II. Prior to Start of Construction

A. Verification of Records Search

1. The PI shall provide verification to MMC that a site-specific records search (quarter- 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 one-quarter-mile radius.

B. PI Shall Attend Precon Meetings

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

responsibility for the cost of curation associated with all phases of the archaeological monitoring program.

3. Identify Areas to be Monitored

- a. Prior to the start of any work that requires monitoring, the PI shall submit an Archaeological Monitoring Exhibit (AME) (with verification that the AME has been reviewed and approved by the Native American consultant/monitor when Native American resources may be impacted) based on the appropriate construction documents (reduced to 11x17) to MMC identifying the areas to be monitored including the delineation of grading/excavation limits.
- b. The AME shall be based on the results of a site-specific records search as well as information regarding the age of existing pipelines, laterals and associated appurtenances and/or any known soil conditions (native or formation).
- c. MMC shall notify the PI that the AME has been approved.

4. When Monitoring Will Occur

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

5. Approval of AME and Construction Schedule

After approval of the AME by MMC, the PI shall submit to MMC written authorization of the AME and Construction Schedule from the CM.

III. During Construction

A. Monitor Shall be Present During Grading/Excavation/Trenching

1. The Archaeological Monitor shall be present full-time during all soil disturbing and grading/excavation/trenching activities which could result in impacts to archaeological resources as identified on the AME. The Construction Manager is responsible for notifying the RE, PI, and MMC of changes to any construction activities such as in the case of a potential safety

concern within the area being monitored. In certain circumstances OSHA safety requirements may necessitate modification of the AME.

2. The Native American consultant/monitor shall determine the extent of their presence during soil disturbing and grading/excavation/trenching activities based on the AME and provide that information to the PI and MMC. If prehistoric resources are encountered during the Native American consultant/monitor's absence, work shall stop, and the Discovery Notification Process detailed in Section III.B-C and IV.A-D shall commence.
3. The PI may submit a detailed letter to MMC during construction requesting a modification to the monitoring program when a field condition such as modern disturbance post-dating the previous grading/trenching activities, presence of fossil formations, or when native soils are encountered that may reduce or increase the potential for resources to be present.
4. The archaeological and Native American consultant/monitor shall document field activity via the Consultant Site Visit Record (CSV). The CSV's shall be faxed by the CM to the RE the first day of monitoring, the last day of monitoring, monthly (Notification of Monitoring Completion), and in the case of ANY discoveries. The RE shall forward copies to MMC.

B. Discovery Notification Process

1. In the event of a discovery, the Archaeological Monitor shall direct the contractor to temporarily divert all soil disturbing activities, including but not limited to digging, trenching, excavating or grading activities in the area of discovery and in the area reasonably suspected to overlay adjacent resources and immediately notify the RE or BI, as appropriate.
2. The Monitor shall immediately notify the PI (unless Monitor is the PI) of the discovery.
3. The PI shall immediately notify MMC by phone of the discovery and shall also submit written documentation to MMC within 24 hours by fax or email with photos of the resource in context, if possible.
4. No soil shall be exported off-site until a determination can be made regarding the significance of the resource specifically if Native American resources are encountered.

C. Determination of Significance

1. The PI and Native American consultant/monitor, where Native American resources are discovered shall evaluate the significance of the resource. If Human Remains are involved, follow protocol in Section IV below.

- a. The PI shall immediately notify MMC by phone to discuss significance determination and shall also submit a letter to MMC indicating whether additional mitigation is required.
- b. If the resource is significant, the PI shall submit an Archaeological Data Recovery Program (ADRP) and obtain written approval of the program from MMC, CM and RE. ADRP and any mitigation must be approved by MMC, RE and/or CM before ground disturbing activities in the area of discovery will be allowed to resume. **Note: If a unique archaeological site is also an historical resource as defined in CEQA Section 15064.5, then the limits on the amount(s) that a project applicant may be required to pay to cover mitigation costs as indicated in CEQA Section 21083.2 shall not apply.**

Note: For pipeline trenching and other linear projects in the public Right-of-Way, the PI shall implement the Discovery Process for Pipeline Trenching projects identified below under "D."

- c. If the resource is not significant, the PI shall submit a letter to MMC indicating that artifacts will be collected, curated, and documented in the Final Monitoring Report. The letter shall also indicate that that no further work is required.
 - (1) Note: For Pipeline Trenching and other linear projects in the public Right-of-Way, if the deposit is limited in size, both in length and depth; the information value is limited and is not associated with any other resource; and there are no unique features/artifacts associated with the deposit, the discovery should be considered not significant.
 - (2) Note: for Pipeline Trenching and other linear projects in the public Right-of-Way, if significance cannot be determined, the Final Monitoring Report and Site Record (DPR Form 523A/B) shall identify the discovery as Potentially Significant.

D. Discovery Process for Significant Resources - Pipeline Trenching and other Linear Projects in the Public Right-of-Way

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

- 1. Procedures for documentation, curation and reporting

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

IV. Discovery of Human Remains

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

A. Notification

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

B. Isolate discovery site

1. Work shall be directed away from the location of the discovery and any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlay adjacent human remains until a determination can be made by the Medical Examiner in consultation with the PI concerning the provenience of the remains.

2. The Medical Examiner, in consultation with the PI, will determine the need for a field examination to determine the provenience.
3. If a field examination is not warranted, the Medical Examiner will determine with input from the PI, if the remains are or are most likely to be of Native American origin.

C. If Human Remains ARE determined to be Native American

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

- (3) Record a document with the County. The document shall be titled "Notice of Reinterment of Native American Remains" and shall include a legal description of the property, the name of the property owner, and the owner's acknowledged signature, in addition to any other information required by PRC 5097.98. The document shall be indexed as a notice under the name of the owner.

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

D. If Human Remains are **NOT** Native American

1. The PI shall contact the Medical Examiner and notify them of the historic era context of the burial.
2. The Medical Examiner will determine the appropriate course of action with the PI and City staff (PRC 5097.98).
3. If the remains are of historic origin, they shall be appropriately removed and conveyed to the San Diego Museum of Man for analysis. The decision for internment of the human remains shall be made in consultation with MMC, EAS, the applicant/landowner, any known descendant group, and the San Diego Museum of Man.

V. Night and/or Weekend Work

A. If night and/or weekend work is included in the contract

1. When night and/or weekend work is included in the contract package, the extent and timing shall be presented and discussed at the precon meeting.
2. The following procedures shall be followed.
 - a. No Discoveries

In the event that no discoveries were encountered during night and/or weekend work, the PI shall record the information on the CSV and submit to MMC via fax by 8AM of the next business day.

- b. Discoveries
All discoveries shall be processed and documented using the existing procedures detailed in Sections III - During Construction, and IV - Discovery of Human Remains. Discovery of human remains shall always be treated as a significant discovery.
- c. Potentially Significant Discoveries
If the PI determines that a potentially significant discovery has been made, the procedures detailed under Section III - During Construction and IV-Discovery of Human Remains shall be followed.
- e. The PI shall immediately contact the RE and MMC, or by 8AM of the next business day to report and discuss the findings as indicated in Section III-B, unless other specific arrangements have been made.

B. If night and/or weekend work becomes necessary during the course of construction

- 1. The Construction Manager shall notify the RE, or BI, as appropriate, a minimum of 24 hours before the work is to begin.
- 2. The RE, or BI, as appropriate, shall notify MMC immediately.

C. All other procedures described above shall apply, as appropriate.

VI. Post Construction

A. Submittal of Draft Monitoring Report

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

Trenching Discovery Process shall be included in the Draft Monitoring Report.

b. Recording Sites with State of California Department of Parks and Recreation

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

3. MMC shall return the Draft Monitoring Report to the PI via the RE for revision or, for preparation of the Final Report.
4. The PI shall submit revised Draft Monitoring Report to MMC via the RE for approval.
5. MMC shall provide written verification to the PI of the approved report.
6. MMC shall notify the RE or BI, as appropriate, of receipt of all Draft Monitoring Report submittals and approvals.

B. Handling of Artifacts

1. The PI shall be responsible for ensuring that all cultural remains collected are cleaned and catalogued.
2. The PI shall be responsible for ensuring that all artifacts are analyzed to identify function and chronology as they relate to the history of the area; that faunal material is identified as to species; and that specialty studies are completed, as appropriate.

C. Curation of artifacts: Accession Agreement and Acceptance Verification

1. The PI shall be responsible for ensuring that all artifacts associated with the survey, testing and/or data recovery for this project are permanently curated with an appropriate institution. This shall be completed in consultation with MMC and the Native American representative, as applicable.
2. When applicable to the situation, the PI shall include written verification from the Native American consultant/monitor indicating that Native American resources were treated in accordance with state law and/or applicable agreements. If the resources were reinterred, verification shall be provided to show what protective measures were taken to ensure no further

disturbance occurs in accordance with Section IV – Discovery of Human Remains, Subsection C.

3. The PI shall submit the Accession Agreement and catalogue record(s) to the RE or BI, as appropriate for donor signature with a copy submitted to MMC.
4. The RE or BI, as appropriate shall obtain signature on the Accession Agreement and shall return to PI with copy submitted to MMC.
5. The PI shall include the Acceptance Verification from the curation institution in the Final Monitoring Report submitted to the RE or BI and MMC.

D. Final Monitoring Report(s)

1. The PI shall submit one copy of the approved Final Monitoring Report to the RE or BI as appropriate, and one copy to MMC (even if negative), within 90 days after notification from MMC of the approved report.
2. The RE shall, in no case, issue the Notice of Completion until receiving a copy of the approved Final Monitoring Report from MMC which includes the Acceptance Verification from the curation institution.

TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

Impacts to Tribal Cultural Resources would be reduced to below a level of significance with implementation of mitigation measures outlined under Historical Resources (Archaeology).

VI. PUBLIC REVIEW DISTRIBUTION:

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

Federal

US Fish and Wildlife Service (23)

State

California Department of Fish and Wildlife (32)

California Natural Resources Agency (43)

State Clearinghouse (46)

City of San Diego

Mayor's Office (91)

Councilmember Moreno, District 8

Development Services Department

EAS

Engineering

Geology

Landscaping

Planning Review
Transportation
Parks and Recreation
DPM

Parks and Recreation Department (77)
Park and Recreation Board (83)
Historical Resources Board (87)
Park Development (93)
City Attorney's Office (93C)

Other Organizations, Groups and Interested Individuals

Sierra Club (165)
San Diego Natural History Museum (166)
San Diego Audubon Society (167)
Mr. Jim Peugh (167A)
California Native Plant Society (170)
Endangered Habitats League, Dan Silver (182)
Endangered Habitats League, Michael Beck (182A)
Carmen Lucas (206)
South Coastal Information Center (210)
San Diego Archaeological Center (212)
San Diego Natural History Museum (213)
Save Our Heritage Organization (214)
Ron Christman (215)
Clint Linton (215B)
Frank Brown – Inter-Tribal Cultural Resources Council (216)
Campo Band of Mission Indians (217)
San Diego County Archaeological Society, Inc. (218)
Kumeyaay Cultural Heritage Preservation (223)
Kumeyaay Cultural Repatriation Committee (225)
Native American Distribution (225 A-S)
Otay Mesa Nestor (228)
Clint Linton, Iipay Nation of Santa Ysabel
Lisa Cumper, Jamul Indian Village
Jesse Pinto, Jamul Indian Village
Angelina Gutierrez, San Pasqual Band of Mission Indians
John Stump
Richard Drury, Lozeau Drury LLP
Komalpreet Toor, Lozeau Drury LLP
Stacey Osborne, Lozeau Drury LLP
Albert Velasquez, Otay Mesa-Nestor CPG
Rory and Leony Lake
Mark Ross
Applicant, City of San Diego Engineering and Capital Projects Department

VII. RESULTS OF PUBLIC REVIEW:

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

Copies of the draft Mitigated Negative Declaration, the Mitigation, Monitoring and Reporting Program and any associated project-specific technical appendices may be accessed on the City's CEQA webpage at <https://www.sandiego.gov/ceqa>.



E. Shearer-Nguyen
Senior Planner
Development Services Department

December 24, 2020

Date of Draft Report

May 13, 2021

Date of Final Report

Analyst: M. Dresser

Attachments: Initial Study Checklist
Figure 1: Location Map
Figure 2: Site Plan

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

DISTRICT 11
4050 TAYLOR STREET, MS-240
SAN DIEGO, CA 92110
PHONE (619) 688-3137
FAX (619) 688-4299
TTY 711
www.dot.ca.gov



City staff response(s) to the California State Transportation Agency comment(s) letter for
Southwest Neighborhood Park, Project No. 654348

January 25, 2021

11-SD-5
PM 3.6

Southwest Neighborhood Park
Jan 2021 MND SCH 2020120458

Mr. Morgan Dresser
City of San Diego
1222 1st Avenue,
San Diego, CA 92101

Dear Mr. Dresser:

1. { Thank you for including the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) in the environmental review process for the Southwest Neighborhood Park located near Interstate 5 (I-5). The mission of Caltrans is to provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California's economy and livability. The Local Development-Intergovernmental Review (LD-IGR) Program reviews land use projects and plans to ensure consistency with our mission and state planning priorities.

Caltrans has following comments:

Hydraulic Study dated June 25, 2020

2. { • Please provide effective studies for Nestor Creek from FEMA & the City of San Diego.
3. { • Please Include FEMA cross sections into Floodplain Studies.
4. { • Please provide appropriate effective study upstream and downstream for effective studies.
5. { • Please define and explain, the Effective Model, Effective Model Re-Run, Corrected Model, etc.

1. Comment noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the draft Mitigated Negative Declaration. No further response is required.
2. The Preliminary Hydraulic Study for Southwest Park and its appendices have been updated to address comments received during public review of the MND. Please refer to Appendix E of the MND dated February 2, 2021.

Updated excerpts from the Effective Flood Insurance Study (FIS) dated April 2016 (06073CV001D / 7D) for Nestor Creek are provided in Appendix B to Appendix E of the MND.

Appendix F, FEMA Hardcopy HEC-2 Data, was inadvertently omitted from Appendix E of the public review Draft MND. Please refer to the updated Appendix F to Appendix E of the MND for excerpts from the FEMA Hardcopy HEC-2 Data.

3. The cross-section references to the FIS/ Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) have been added to the working maps provided in Appendix H to Appendix E of the MND. Please see response to Comment 2. Excerpts from the legacy HEC-2 hardcopy data used for the effective model-rerun is provided in the updated Appendix F to Appendix E of the MND.
4. Please see response to Comment 2.
5. This comment requests an explanation of the HEC-RAS Analyses and Cross-Sections provided in Appendix C to Appendix E of the MND. The "Effective Model" is the FIS 2016 (06073CV001D / 7D) included in Appendix B to Appendix E of the MND, which generally corresponds with the FIRM elevations. This model was recreated as "Effective Model Re-run" by inputting the hardcopy HEC-2 data from Appendix F to Appendix E of the MND into HEC-RAS. The "Corrected Model" uses a revised flowrate for Nestor Creek which was decreased to 456 cubic feet per second due to the construction of a Detention Basin upstream of the railroad, as specified in FIS 2016 (06073CV001D) page 82, included in Appendix B to Appendix E of the MND.

Mr. Morgan Dresser
January 25, 2021
Page 2

6. {
 - Appendix F is missing from the study.
7. {
 - Please provide a copy of the LOMR Effective Study.
8. {
 - The proposed project features may significantly alter the FEMA defined Floodplain and associated water surface elevations through the project area and have potential adverse impacts to the I-5 and Interstate 805 (I-805) facilities. The Department requests that the City of San Diego, acting as the Local FEMA Administrator, include the Department in reviews of all submittals to the Development Services Department regarding floodplain administration and allow for the Department to comment prior to the Conditional Letter of Map Revision (CLOMR) application or the Permit issue, to assure that the Department's assets are not adversely impacted by any change in the water surface elevation resulting from this project.
9. {
 - In addition, per 44 CFR §65.12, the Department requests that a formal notification be sent to the Department when the City of San Diego approves the permit to alter the floodplain and/or when the Developer applies for the Conditional Letter of Map Revision (CLOMR) and Letter of Map Revision (LOMR).

Preliminary Drainage Study dated June 25, 2020

10. {
 - Please recheck the Existing & Proposed Hydrology Calculations. There is a warning message stating: "Initial Subarea flow path length is great than the maximum overland flow length." Please reference Table 3-1b of Caltrans Hydrology Manual.
11. {
 - Please verify and revised initial flow lengths. Does the city have a maximum flow path as in the county hydrology manual?
12. {
 - Plans are showing diversion of flow from the existing to proposed conditions. Diversion of flow is not permitted.
13. {
 - Analysis will be needed for Caltrans drainage facilities that are being tied into from the project.

City staff response(s) to the California State Transportation Agency comment(s) letter for Southwest Neighborhood Park, Project No. 654348

6. Please refer to response to Comment 2.
7. LOMR Case No. 03-09-0633P effective 2003 is included in Appendix G of Appendix E to the MND.
8. As stated in the Introduction (pg. 1) of Appendix E to the MND, the project will be required to comply with the City of San Diego and FEMA requirements for development within the floodplain and will not cause significant changes to the Base Flood Elevations (BFE). A CLOMR will be required to be submitted and reviewed/approved by FEMA and the City of San Diego during ministerial review, and no significant rise in base flood elevations is allowed by the City of San Diego or FEMA.

Caltrans will be notified of the LOMR process during ministerial plan check and will have the opportunity to review and comment on the technical studies and grading plans. As part of the LOMR process, a notification letter will be sent out to all affected properties adjacent to the proposed development, including upstream and downstream properties that may see increases or decreases in water surface elevation as a result of the development. An advertisement will also be posted in the San Diego Daily Transcript to notify the public of the changes as part of the LOMR process. This will ensure Caltrans is included in the LOMR process before the CLOMR is submitted to FEMA for approval.

The Introduction (pg. 2) of Appendix E to the MND has been revised to include Caltrans on the list of reviewers for the CLOMR. The title of Appendix E to the MND has also been revised to differentiate between the preliminary and final design phases of the project.

9. A notification to Caltrans will be sent as requested.
10. The Existing Hydrology Calculations provided in Appendix 4 of Appendix D to the MND were performed in accordance with the City of San Diego Drainage Design Manual 2017, which does not include a maximum initial subarea flow path length. The warning is shown in the AES software because the software can be used for County of San Diego Hydrology manual criteria projects, which do include a maximum initial subarea flow length. Therefore, the maximum flow length warning would not apply.
11. Please see response to Comment 10.
12. Section 4.1.1 of the City's Drainage Design Manual (January 2017) states, "Diversion of drainage is not allowed (i.e., the discharge point and all inlets of a storm drain

**City staff response(s) to the California State Transportation Agency comment(s) letter for
Southwest Neighborhood Park, Project No. 654348**

system shall be within the same watershed).” The project does not propose to divert flow as defined by the City’s Drainage Design Manual.

As described in the Appendix E of the MND, the project site currently drains to the northwest into an existing 24-inch culvert. The project currently proposes to reroute onsite flow so that approximately half of the site drains to the existing 24-inch reinforced concrete pipe (RCP) in the northwest corner of the site and the other half drains to an existing 18-inch RCP in the southwestern portion of the site. The existing 18-inch and 24-inch RCPs both currently drain to the west and discharge to Nestor Creek. The project will not change the discharge points as the RCPs will continue to discharge to Nestor Creek after implementation of the project. Ultimately, the project will result in a total net decrease of 4.69 cubic feet per second or 17% in the 100-year peak runoff from the studied area of 17.64 acres by developing the city-owned lot into a usable public park and installing storm drain facilities to convey and mitigate site runoff.

The proposed onsite storm drain system can be modified during ministerial permitting to satisfy the request by Caltrans to maintain the existing drainage basin areas.

13. Caltrans will be provided with additional analysis at the time of final engineering for review and approval.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Mr. Morgan Dresser
January 25, 2021
Page 3

Right-of-Way

14. { Any work performed within Caltrans' Right-of-Way (R/W) will require discretionary review and approval by Caltrans and an encroachment permit will be required for any work within the Caltrans' R/W prior to construction.

If you have any questions, please contact Roger Sanchez, of Caltrans' District 11 Development Review Branch, at (619) 987-1043 or by e-mail sent to roger.sanchez-rangel@dot.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

electronically signed by

MAURICE EATON, Branch Chief
Local Development and Intergovernmental Review Branch

**City staff response(s) to the California State Transportation Agency comment(s) letter for
Southwest Neighborhood Park, Project No. 654348**

14. Comment noted. The project does not propose work within the Caltrans right of way. Should work within the Caltrans right-of-way be required, the City would submit for an encroachment permit from Caltrans prior to construction.



San Diego County Archaeological Society, Inc.

Environmental Review Committee

28 December 2020

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

Subject: Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration
Southwest Neighborhood Park
Project No. 654348

Dear Ms. Dresser:

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

Based on the information contained in the DMND and its cultural resources report, we agree with the impact analysis and mitigation measures as included in the DMND. Our only comment on the cultural resources report by Helix would be that it would have been helpful if the historic aerial photos had been reproduced in the report as they are generally not publicly accessible without paying a fee.

Thank you for providing SDCAS this opportunity to review and offer our comments on this project's environmental documents.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "James W. Royle, Jr.", is written over the typed name.

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

cc: Helix Environmental
SDCAS President
File

P.O. Box 81106 San Diego, CA 92138-1106 (858) 538-0935

City staff response(s) to the San Diego County Archaeological Society, Inc. comment(s) letter
for Southwest Neighborhood Park, Project No. 654348

15. Comment noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the draft Mitigated Negative Declaration. No further response is required.

From: Mark Ross <moshesroskin@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, December 26, 2020 12:52 PM
To: DSD EAS <DSEAS@sanidiego.gov>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Southwest neighborhood park project #654348

****This email came from an external source. Be cautious about clicking on any links in this email or opening attachments.****

To: Mr. Morgan Dresser

16. {
My wife and I support the planned park. We've been waiting a long time and we hope that this project can start ASAP.
We have been living at the Caminito Grove community since 1985.
Thank you Mr. Dresser for allowing our opinion and input to be part of the process.

Respectfully,

Mark S. Ross
2578 CMTO AVELLANO
SAN DIEGO, CA 92154

City staff response(s) to the comment(s) letter from Mark Ross for Southwest Neighborhood
Park, Project No. 654348

16. Comment noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the draft Mitigated Negative Declaration. No further response is required.

INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

1. Project title/Project number: Southwest Neighborhood Park / 654348
2. Lead agency name and address: City of San Diego, 1222 First Avenue, MS-501, San Diego, California, 92101
3. Contact person and phone number: Morgan Dresser / (619) 446-5404
4. Project location: 1305 25th Street and 1362 27th Street, San Diego, California 92154
5. Project Applicant/Sponsor's name and address: City of San Diego Engineering and Capital Projects Department
6. General/Community Plan designation: Park, Open Space, Recreation / Park
7. Zoning: RS-1-7
8. Description of project (Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to, later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation.):

The project proposes to construct an 11.53-acre community park comprised of a 3.2 -acre lighted multi-purpose field, one full and two half-court basketball courts, a fitness area featuring exercise stations, a 1,125-square-foot comfort station, an 11,155-square-foot playground, a 3,500-square-foot playground, four picnic areas with shade structures and tables, a performance amphitheater and an overlook plaza. In addition, a 23,095-square-foot large dog park and a 12,260-square foot small dog park are proposed. The project would provide two parking lots with 53 parking spaces. Additional improvements would include paved walking paths and accessible ramps, security lighting, benches, game tables, drinking fountains, interpretive education panels, two monument signs, entry gateways, storm water treatment basins, and associated landscaping.

The project landscaping would comply with all applicable City of San Diego Landscape ordinances and standards. Drainage would be directed into appropriate storm drain systems designated to carry surface runoff. Ingress and egress would be via 25th Street and 27th Street. Hours of operation would be 5:00am to 10:00pm.

Grading would entail approximately 41,000 cubic yards of cut with a maximum cut depth of thirteen feet seven inches.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting:

The vacant 11.53-acre project site is located at 1305 25th Street and 1362 27th Street. The project site is designated Park and zoned RS-1-7 per the Otay Mesa-Nestor Community Plan. Vegetation on-site consists of non-native grasslands. The site is surrounded with residential uses to the north, south and east and with Interstate-5 to the west, and bounded by 25th Street to the west, 27th Street to the east, Grove Avenue to the north and residential

development to the south. In addition, the project site is located in a developed area currently served by existing public services and utilities.

The project site is within the Airport Land Use Compatibility Overlay Zone (Brown Field), the Airport Influence Area (Brown Field- Review Area 2), the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Part 77 Noticing Area for Naval Outlying Landing Field-Imperial Beach, the Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone, the Parking Standards Transit Priority Area, and the Transit Priority Area.

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

None required.

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

In accordance with the requirements of Public Resources Code 21080.3.1, the City of San Diego provided formal notifications to the Lipay Nation of Santa Ysabel, the Jamul Indian Village and San Pasqual Band of Mission Indians, all traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area; requesting consultation on September 28, 2020. San Pasqual Band of Mission Indians responded within the 30-day notification period requesting consultation.

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

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

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

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

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

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

I. AESTHETICS – Would the project:

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

The project site is not located within, or adjacent to a designated scenic vista or view corridor that is identified in the Otay Mesa-Nestor Community Plan. Therefore, the project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista. No impact would result.

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

The project is situated within a developed neighborhood comprised of residential uses. There are no scenic resources (trees, rock outcroppings, or historic buildings) located on the project site. The project would not result in the physical loss, isolation, or degradation of a community identification symbol or landmark, as none are identified by the General Plan or community plan as occurring in the project vicinity. Therefore, no impact would result.

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

The vacant project site is located within a neighborhood with residential uses. The topography of the site would be minimally altered to allow for the development of the park. The project is compatible with the surrounding development and permitted by the General Plan, community plan land use and zoning designations. The project would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings; therefore, no impact would result.

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

Lighting

The project would comply with the outdoor lighting standards in Municipal Code Section 142.0740 (*Outdoor Lighting Regulations*) that require all outdoor lighting be installed, shielded, and adjusted so that the light is directed in a manner that minimizes negative impacts from light pollution, including trespass, glare, and to control light from falling onto surrounding properties. Hours of operation would be 5:00am to 10:00pm. Therefore, lighting installed with the project would not adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area, resulting in a less than significant lighting impact.

Glare

The project would be required to comply with Municipal Code Section 142.0730 (Glare Regulations) that require exterior materials utilized for proposed structures be limited to specific reflectivity ratings. The project proposes minimal structures which would consist of wood siding, wood shingles,

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

adobe and concrete blocks, brick, stucco, concrete or natural stone. The project would have a less than significant glare impact.

As such, the project would not create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area; impacts would be less than significant.

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

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Converts Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The project site is located within a developed residential neighborhood. As such, the project site does not contain nor is it adjacent to any lands identified as Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland) as show on maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resource Agency. Therefore, the project would not result in the conversion of such lands to non-agricultural use. No impact would result.

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

Refer to response II (a), above. There are no Williamson Act Contract Lands on or within the vicinity of the site. Furthermore, the project would not affect any properties zoned for agricultural use or affected by a Williamson Act Contract, as there are none within the project vicinity. Agricultural land is not present on the site or in the general vicinity of the site; therefore, no conflict with the Williamson Act Contract would result. No impact would result.

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

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

The project would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production. No designated forest land or timberland occur onsite. No impacts would result.

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

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

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| e) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

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

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

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

The project site is located in the San Diego Air Basin (SDAB) and is under the jurisdiction of the San Diego Air Pollution Control District (SDAPCD) and the California Air Resources Board (CARB). Both the State of California and the Federal government have established health-based Ambient Air Quality Standards (AAQS) for the following six criteria pollutants: carbon monoxide (CO); ozone (O₃); nitrogen oxides (NO_x); sulfur oxides (SO_x); particulate matter up to 10 microns in diameter (PM₁₀); and lead (Pb). O₃ (smog) is formed by a photochemical reaction between NO_x and reactive organic compounds (ROCs). Thus, impacts from O₃ are assessed by evaluating impacts from NO_x and ROCs. A new increase in pollutant emissions determines the impact on regional air quality as a result of a proposed project. The results also allow the local government to determine whether a proposed project would deter the region from achieving the goal of reducing pollutants in accordance with the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) in order to comply with Federal and State AAQS.

The SDAPCD and San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) are responsible for developing and implementing the clean air plan for attainment and maintenance of the ambient air quality standards in the SDAB. The County Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) was initially adopted in 1991 and is updated on a triennial basis (most recently in 2009). The RAQS outlines the SDAPCD's plans and control measures designed to attain the state air quality standards for ozone (O₃).

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

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

The project would be consistent with the General Plan, community plan land use designation and underlying zone designations. Therefore, the project would be consistent with the RAQS and would not obstruct implementation of the RAQS. No impact would result.

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

Short-Term (Construction) Emissions. Construction-related activities are temporary, short-term sources of air emissions. Sources of construction-related air emissions include fugitive dust from grading activities; construction equipment exhaust; construction-related trips by workers, delivery trucks, and material-hauling trucks; and construction-related power consumption.

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

Fugitive dust emissions are generally associated with land-clearing and grading operations. Construction operations would include standard measures as required by the City of San Diego to limit potential air quality impacts. Therefore, impacts associated with fugitive dust are considered less than significant and would not violate an air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.

Long-Term (Operational) Emissions. Long-term air emission impacts are those associated with stationary sources and mobile sources related to any change caused by a project. The project would produce minimal stationary sources emissions. The project is compatible with the surrounding development and is permitted by the General Plan, community plan land use and zoning designations. Based on the land use, project emissions over the long-term are not anticipated to violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

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

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| d) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Short-term (Construction)

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

Long-term (Operational)

In the long-term operation, park uses, are not uses typically associated with the creation of objectionable odors nor are they anticipated to generate odors affecting a substantial number or people. Therefore, project operations would result in less than significant impacts.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

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

In August 2020 a Biological Technical Report (BLR) titled, *Southwest Neighborhood Park Biological Technical Report*, was prepared by City of San Diego, Engineering and Capital Projects Department, for Southwest Neighborhood Park. This report analyzed the impacts of the proposed project on biological resources located within the project limits and a 100-foot survey buffer. The project site lies within the boundaries of the City's Multiple Species Conservation Plan (MSCP) Subarea. However, the project does not overlap nor is it adjacent to the Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA).

The BLR indicated that the project proposes to impact 11.53 acres of vegetation. Of this, 5.17 acres of Disturbed vegetation and 6.36 acres of Non-native Annual Grassland will be impacted. The project would result in direct impacts to one sensitive vegetation community, Annual Grassland (6.36 acres). Annual Grassland is designated as Tier IIIB habitat and requires mitigation per the Land

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

Development Code Biology Guidelines. Impacts will be mitigated at a ratio of 0.5:1 for a total of 3.13 acres. Mitigation will occur through payment into the Habitat Acquisition Fund for 3.13 acres.

Vegetation Communities	Tier Level	Temporary Impacts (acres)	Permanent Impacts (acres)	Mitigation Ratio	Mitigation Required (acres)
Non-Native Grassland	IIIB	0	6.36	0.5:1	3.13
Disturbed	IV	0	5.17	0:0	0
Grand Totals		0	11.53		3.13

Table 3. Project Impacts on Vegetation Communities and Land Types

The BTR indicated that no state or federally listed wildlife species were observed onsite or within the 100-foot survey buffer and habitat is not present for species historically observed within the area.

Therefore, a Mitigation Monitoring Reporting Program (MMRP) as detailed in Section V of the Mitigated Negative Declaration would be implemented. With implementation of the MMRP, potential biological resources impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance.

- b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?
- ☐
☐
☐
☒

As described in section IV. a. there are no riparian habitats or other communities that would sustain substantial adverse effects within the project area. The project is located approximately 50-feet away from a channelized wetland. A paved road and sidewalk are located directly adjacent to the wetland, between the wetland and project. For projects outside of the Coastal Zone, the City's Biology Guidelines and ESL Regulations require a buffer which provides functions and values in order to achieve no net loss of wetland habitat. The BTR concluded that the 50-foot buffer was adequate to protect the functions and values of the channelized wetland. The project will not encroach into or modify the existing wetland buffer.

- c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including but not limited to marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?
- ☐
☐
☐
☒

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

Refer to section IV (b). The project will not impact federally protected wetlands.

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

Refer to IV (c). This project is not located within waterways, MHPA, wildlife linkage or migratory wildlife corridor and will not impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites. Therefore, no impacts will occur to movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species.

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

Please see section IV. A. The project would comply with all applicable policies and ordinances which protect biological species.

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

This project is located within areas covered by the City's MSCP Subarea Plan which was prepared to meet the requirements of the California Natural Communities Conservation Plan (NCCP) Act of 1992. The City's Multiple Habitat Planning Area (MHPA) acts as a preserve for the MSCP. This project does not overlap with the MHPA and is not adjacent to the MHPA. Implementation of mitigation at the ratios specified in the City's MSCP Subarea Plan and Biology Guidelines would reduce all impacts to below a level of significance.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

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

The purpose and intent of the Historical Resources Regulations of the Land Development Code (Chapter 14, Division 3, and Article 2) is to protect, preserve and, where damaged, restore the historical resources of San Diego. The regulations apply to all proposed development within the City of San Diego when historical resources are present on the premises. Before approving discretionary projects, CEQA requires the Lead Agency to identify and examine the significant adverse environmental effects which may result from that project. A project that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource may have a significant effect on the environment (sections 15064.5(b) and 21084.1). A substantial adverse change is defined as

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

demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration activities, which would impair historical significance (sections 15064.5(b)(1)). Any historical resource listed in, or eligible to be listed in the California Register of Historical Resources, including archaeological resources, is considered to be historically or culturally significant.

The City of San Diego criteria for determination of historic significance, pursuant to CEQA, is evaluated based upon age (over 45 years), location, context, association with an important event, uniqueness, or structural integrity of the building. Projects requiring the demolition and/or modification of structures that are 45 years or older can result in potential impacts to a historical resource. There are no existing structures on site. Therefore, no impacts would result.

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

Many areas of San Diego County, including mesas and the coast, are known for intense and diverse prehistoric occupation and important archaeological and historical resources. The region has been inhabited by various cultural groups spanning 10,000 years or more. The project area is located within an area identified as sensitive on the City of San Diego Historical Resources Sensitivity Maps. Qualified City staff conducted a records search of the California Historic Resources Information System (CHRIS) digital database; the search identified several previously recorded historic and prehistoric sites in the project vicinity. Based on this information, there is a potential for buried cultural resources to be impacted through implementation of the project. Therefore, an archaeological resources report was prepared by Helix Environmental Planning (December 2018), which included literature review, record search, Native American Consultation, and completion of a pedestrian field survey of the parcel along with a Kumeyaay Native American monitor, per the City's requirements. The results and conclusions of the technical report are summarized below.

According to South Coastal Information Center (SCIC) 53 reports are on file within a one-mile radius. One report is within the projects area of potential effects (APE) with a total of 18 cultural resources recorded, and one archaeological site documented within the northeast portion of the project site. The site was first recorded in 1986 as a disturbed surface scatter of *Donax gouldii* shell with tan, loamy soil. It was noted the site had been previously disturbed by the construction of a motocross track, and no remaining portions were intact. The remaining cultural resources include five historic buildings; two historic structures including a water tower and the Union Pacific Railroad; one historic object, the Montgomery Memorial (California Historical Landmark #711); and four historic archaeological sites.

During the pedestrian field survey visibility was limited by dense grasses and weeds, which covered a majority of the site. The survey reidentified the shell scatter recorded in 1986 (P-37-010639/CA-SDI-10639). Additionally, several fragments of historical ceramics and glass were observed in the northeastern portion of the site. Based upon the results of the survey, records search, and test pits, there is a potential for cultural resources to exist on the project site, and monitoring during ground-disturbing activities would be required.

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

Therefore, a Mitigation Monitoring Reporting Program, as detailed within Section V of the MND, would be implemented. With implementation of the historical resources monitoring program, potential impacts on historical resources would be reduced to less than significant.

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

The Geology of the San Diego Metropolitan Area, California (1975) published by the California Division of Mines and Geology, shows the project site to be underlain by Young Alluvial Flood Plain deposits and Old Paralic Deposits, which are assigned a low and high sensitivity rating for paleontological resources, respectively.

According to the City of San Diego's Significance Determination Thresholds, more than 1,000 cubic yards of grading at depths of greater than 10 feet (less than 10 feet if the site has been graded) into formations with a high resource sensitivity rating could result in a significant impact to paleontological resources, and mitigation would be required.

Grading operations would entail approximately 41,000 cubic yards of cut with a maximum cut depth of thirteen-feet seven-inches. The projects grading exceeds the CEQA Significance Determination Thresholds, therefore, the project would require paleontological monitoring during grading and/or excavation activities in accordance with SDMC Section 142.0151 (Paleontological Resources Requirements for Grading Activities). Compliance with these SDMC regulations are assured through permit conditions. Implementation of the Paleontological Resources Requirements for Grading Activities, as required by SDMC Section 142.0151, would ensure that impacts to paleontological resources would be less than significant.

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

There are no formal cemeteries or known burials in the immediate vicinity of the project site. In the unlikely event of a discovery of human remains, the project would be handled in accordance with procedures of the California Public Resources Code (§5097.98), State Health and Safety Code (§7050.5), and California Government Code Section 27491. These regulations detail specific procedures to follow in the event of a discovery of human remains, i.e. work would be required to halt and no soil would be exported off-site until a determination could be made via the County Coroner and other authorities as required. In addition, the Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Program requires the presence of archaeological and Native American monitors during grading that would ensure that any buried human remains inadvertently uncovered during grading operations are identified and handled in compliance with these regulations (see V. b). As no known burials exist within the project site, it is not anticipated that human remains would be encountered during construction. Therefore, no impact would occur.

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

VI. ENERGY – Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The proposed project includes construction and operation of a public park with the aforementioned amenities.

During construction, the project would consume energy in two general forms: (1) the fuel energy consumed by construction vehicles and equipment; and (2) bound energy in construction materials, such as asphalt, steel, concrete, pipes, and manufactured or processed materials such as lumber and glass. Title 24 Building Energy Efficiency Standards provide guidance on construction techniques to maximize energy conservation and it is expected that contractors and owners have a strong financial incentive to use recycled materials and products originating from nearby sources in order to reduce materials costs. As such, it is anticipated that materials used in construction and construction vehicle fuel energy would not involve the wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy. At buildout, the park would not require substantial amounts of energy during project operation.

The project would be required to implement and be consistent with existing energy design standards at the local and state level. The Project would be subject to energy conservation requirements in the California Energy Code and CALGreen. Adherence to state code requirements would ensure that the Project would not result in wasteful and inefficient use of non- renewable resources due to building operation.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Refer to VI (a) above.

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS – Would the project:

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

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

GEOCON prepared a Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation for the Southwest Neighborhood Park project dated March 2019. Based on this Geotechnical Investigation, there are no active, potentially active, or inactive faults located within the project site. The project site is not located within the Downtown Special Studies Fault Zone or Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. The closest known fault is an unnamed fault located approximately 1,200 feet north of the project site.

The closest known active fault is the Newport-Inglewood/Rose Canyon project site. Fault Zone located approximately 4 miles west of the project site. Earthquakes that generate from these faults or from other faults within southern California are potential generators of significant ground motion at the project site. However, the project would be required to comply with seismic requirement of the California Building Code, utilize proper engineering design and standard construction practices, to be verified at the building permit stage, in order to ensure that would reduce impacts to people or structures to an acceptable level of risk. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

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

Refer to VII (a)(i).

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Liquefaction generally occurs when loose, unconsolidated, water-laden soils are subject to shaking, causing the soils to lose cohesion. According to the site-specific geotechnical investigation, the site would have a low risk for liquefaction due to dense nature of the underlying soils and recommended remedial grading. As such, the likelihood of the proposed project exposing people to seismic related ground failure or liquefaction is considered to be low, resulting in a less than significant impact.

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

According to the site-specific geotechnical investigation, the evidence of landslides or slope instabilities were not observed at the project site and the potential for landslides or slope instabilities to occur at the site is considered low. Due to the topography, the absence of significant nearby slopes or hills, and the planned site grading, the potential for landslides is considered negligible. Implementation of proper engineering design and utilization of standard construction practices, to be verified at the building permit stage, would ensure that the potential for impacts would be reduced to an acceptable level of risk. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

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

Construction activities would temporarily expose soils to increase erosion potential. Grading activities would be required to comply with the City's Grading Ordinance as well as the Storm Water Standards, which would ensure soil erosion and topsoil loss is minimized to less than significant levels. Furthermore, permanent storm water BMP would also be required post-construction

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

consistent with the City's regulations. Therefore, the project would not result in substantial soils erosion or loss of topsoil and impacts would be less than significant.

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

As discussed in Section VI(a) and VI(b), the project site has a low potential to be subject to landslides, and the potential for liquefaction and subsidence is low. The soils and geologic units underlying the site are considered to have a "low to medium" expansion potential. The project design would be required to comply with the requirements of the California Building Code ensuring hazards associated with expansive soils would be reduced to an acceptable level of risk. As such, impacts due to expansive soils are expected to be less than significant.

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

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

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

The project does not include the installation of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. The park would be constructed for visitor use and would be tied to the City's established wastewater infrastructure system. Therefore, no impact would occur.

VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS – Would the project:

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

CAP Consistency Checklist

The project is consistent with the existing General Plan and Otay Mesa-Nestor Community Plan land use and zoning designations for the site. Therefore, the project is consistent with the growth

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

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. 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 amendment or a rezone.

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

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

Refer to Section VII (a). Impacts would be less than significant.

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Would the project:

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

Project construction activities may involve the use and transport of hazardous materials. These materials may include fuels, oils, mechanical fluids, and other chemicals used during construction. Transportation, storage, use, and disposal of hazardous materials during construction activities would be required to comply with applicable federal, state, and local statutes and regulations. Compliance would ensure that human health and the environment are not exposed to hazardous materials. Therefore, no significant impacts would occur during construction activities.

The operational phase of the project would occur after construction is completed. The project includes land uses that are considered compatible with the surrounding uses. None of these land uses routinely transport, use, or dispose of hazardous materials, or present a reasonably foreseeable release of hazardous materials, with the potential exception of common commercial grade hazardous materials such as household and commercial cleaners, paint, etc. The project would not create a significant hazard through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, nor would a significant hazard to the public or to the environment through the reasonably foreseeable upset and accidental conditions involving the likely release of hazardous materials into the environment occur. Therefore, the proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment and any impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

hazardous materials into the environment?

Refer to IX (a), above. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

There are no existing or proposed schools located within one-quarter mile of the site. Therefore, no impact would occur.

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

A search of potential hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 was completed for the project site. Based on the searches conducted, the project site is not identified on a list of hazardous materials sites. As such, no impact would occur that would create a significant hazard to the public or environment.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two mile of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The project is within the Airport Influence Area (Review Area 2) of the Brown Field Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALCUP). The Airport Influence Area is the area in which current and projected future-related airport noise, safety, airspace protection, or overflight factors/layers may significantly affect land use or necessitate restrictions on land use. Per the ALCUP, Review Area 2 is defined by the combination of the airspace protection and overflight boundaries beyond Review Area 1. Only airspace protection and overflight policies and standards apply within Review Area 2. The project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area in that the project would be consistent with land use plans and underlying zones. The proposed development would not penetrate the FAA notification surface and is nor proposed at greater than 200 feet above grade, therefore, the proposal is not required to notify the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) per Municipal Code Section 132.1520(c). Impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

The project site is not in proximity to any private airstrip. Therefore, no impact would occur.

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

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

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

The project is located within a developed neighborhood. There are no wildlands on or adjacent to the project site. No impact would occur.

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY - Would the project:

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

According to the City's Storm Water Requirements Applicability Checklist, the project is identified as a Priority Development Project and therefore required to prepare a Storm Water Quality Management Plan prepared by Fuscoe Engineering (June 2020) to identify and implement required best management practices (BMP) for storm water pollutant control (BMP Design Manual Chapter 5, Part 1 of Storm Water Standards). During construction, the project would be required to comply with all storm water quality standards including implementing appropriate construction BMP. Four biofiltration basins would be constructed, which would be implemented as the project's permanent BMP's. These requirements have been reviewed by qualified staff and would be re-verified during the ministerial process. Adherence with the standards would ensure adverse impacts associated with compliance with quality standards and waste discharge requirements are avoided. Impacts would be less than significant.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

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

The project does not require the construction of wells or the use of groundwater. Therefore, the project would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge. The project is located in an urban neighborhood where all infrastructures exist. The project would connect to the existing public water system. No impact would result.

- c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner, which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

☐
☐
☒
☐

The vacant site currently sheet flows to the northwest corner and drains into an existing 24-inch culvert that crosses Interstate 5 and ultimately discharges into Nestor Creek. The project includes permanent changes to the existing stormwater drainage pattern of the area through construction of permanent impermeable surfaces and the various park amenities. The drainage pattern would be altered slightly to accommodate the development and to facilitate the conveyance of the runoff to the proposed biofiltration BMP's. Drainage would be collected onsite and conveyed to four biofiltration basins before discharging into the existing 24-inch culvert. The project would result in a net decrease of 4.69 cubic feet per second in the 100-year peak runoff as outlined in the site-specific Preliminary Drainage Study (Fusco Engineering, June 2020).

There are no streams or rivers located on-site and thus, no such resources would be impacted through the proposed grading activities. Although grading would be required for the project, the project would implement BMPs to ensure that substantial erosion or siltation on or off-site would not occur. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

☐
☐
☒
☐

Refer to XI (c). Impacts would be less than significant.

- e) Create or contribute runoff water, which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

☐
☐
☒
☐

The project would be required to comply with all City storm water standards during and after construction. Appropriate best management practices would be implemented to ensure that water quality is not degraded; therefore, ensuring that project runoff is directed to appropriate drainage systems. Any runoff from the site is not anticipated to exceed the capacity of existing storm water

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

systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

Refer to Section IX (a). The project would be required to comply with all City storm water standards both during and after construction, using appropriate best management practices that would ensure that water quality is not degraded. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) maps the eastern half of the site within Flood Zone X, indicating a minimal risk to inundation by 100-year and 500-year floods. The western and northern portion of the site is within zone AH, which is mapped as a special flood hazard area and may be subject to flooding. However, the project does not propose any housing. No impact would occur.

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

Refer to X (g), above. No structures would be located within the flood hazard area. The project would construct a park. No impacts would occur.

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING – Would the project:

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

The project is compatible with the surrounding development and permitted by the General Plan, community plan land use and zoning designations. The project would not substantially change the nature of the surrounding area and would not introduce any barriers or project features that could physically divide the community. Thus, the project would result in no impact related to physically dividing an established community. No impact would occur.

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

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

The project site is designated Park and zoned RS-1-7 per the Otay Mesa-Nestor Community Plan area. The project is consistent with the underlying zone and the land use designation. The project would not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including but not limited to the general plan, community plan, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. No impact would result.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The project is located within a developed neighborhood and would not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. No impact would occur.

XII. MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

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

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

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

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

XIII. NOISE – Would the project result in:

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

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

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

compliance to the City's noise ordinance, project construction noise levels would be reduced to less than significant.

Typical long-term operational noise, associated with recreational uses are anticipated, and the project would not result in an increase in the existing ambient noise level. The project would not result in noise levels in excess of standards established in the City of San Diego General Plan or Noise Ordinance. No significant long-term impacts would occur, therefore impacts would be less than significant.

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

Pile driving activities that would potentially result in ground borne vibration or ground borne noise are not anticipated with construction of the project. As described in Response to XII (a) above, potential effects from construction noise would be reduced through compliance with the City's Noise Ordinance. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

The project would not significantly increase long-term noise levels. The project would not introduce a new land use, or significantly increase the intensity of the allowed land use. Post-construction noise levels and traffic would not substantially increase as compared to the existing residential use. Therefore, no substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels is anticipated. A less than significant impact would occur.

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

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

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

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

residing or working in the area to excessive noise levels?

There are no airports located within two miles of or adjacent to the project site, with the closest airport being Brown Field Airport, approximately four miles from the site. The risk of aircraft related noise exposure associated with the implementation of the project is considered low. Therefore, no impact would occur.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. No impact would occur.

XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING – Would the project:

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

There are no residential structures currently onsite. As the project does not include housing, the project would not affect any required population or housing. No impact would occur.

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

No such displacement would result. The project site is currently vacant, and a recreational park would be constructed. No impacts would occur.

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

No such displacement would result. The project site is currently vacant, and a recreational park would be constructed. No impacts would occur.

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES

- a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provisions of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service rations, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

- | | | | | |
|--------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| i) Fire protection | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

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

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

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

The project site is located in an urbanized area where police protection services are provided. The site would continue to be served by the City. The project would not adversely affect existing levels of police protection services to the area and would not require the construction of new or expanded governmental facilities. Impacts to fire protection would be less than significant.

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

The project does not propose residential uses that would bring families with school age children. Therefore, the project would not increase the demand on public schools over that which currently exists and is not anticipated to result in a significant increase in demand for public educational services. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

The project would improve the recreational facilities in the area by providing additional public park amenities. The project would construct a new park within a community; therefore, the project would not significantly increase the demand on existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities over that which presently exists and is not anticipated to result in a significant increase in demand for parks or other offsite recreational facilities. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

The project site is located in an urbanized and developed area where City services are already available. The project would not adversely affect existing levels of other public facilities and not require the construction or expansion of an existing governmental facility. Impacts would be less than significant.

XVI. RECREATION

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

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

The project includes the construction of a public park and associated park amenities, totaling approximately 11.53 acres. The project would not cause physical deterioration of existing recreational facilities from increased usage or result in the need for new or expanded recreational facilities, other than what is analyzed in this document. Rather, the project would extend the use of nearby existing recreational areas by providing additional spaces for residents to recreate. No impact would occur.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Refer to XV (a) above. The project would create a neighborhood park and would therefore include recreational facilities. The project would not require additional expansion of existing recreational facilities and would therefore not have an adverse effect on the environment. No impact would occur.

XVII. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC – Would the project?

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

The project is consistent with the General Plan and Otay Mesa-Nestor Community Plan land use and zoning designation. The project would not change existing circulation patterns on area roadways. The project would not conflict with any applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| b) Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3 subdivision (b)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Refer to XVII (a). The project would be is a locally serving public facility project, which is consistent with the land use and zoning designation. The project is presumed to have a less than significant impact on Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT). Therefore, the project would not be inconsistent with CEQA section 15064.3 (b). Impacts would be less than significant.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| c) Would the project or plan/policy substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

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

dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

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

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

The project would not result in inadequate emergency access. The project design would be subject to City review and approval for consistency with all design requirements to ensure that no impediments to emergency access occur. No impacts would result.

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

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

The project would not cause a substantial adverse effect to tribal cultural resources, as there are no recorded sites listed or sites eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined by the Public Resources Code. No impact would result.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

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

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

The Sacred Lands File check from the NAHC indicated that no known sacred lands or Native American cultural resources have been identified within the project area and as stated above in Section V, the SCIC records search identified 18 cultural resources within a one-mile radius and one shell scatter within the project site. The cultural resource had been disturbed with no portions intact, remaining scatter was observed during the field survey.

In accordance with the requirements of PRC Section 21080.3.1, Assembly Bill (AB) 52, the City notified Native American tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area. The tribes were sent notification letters on September 28, 2020 informing them of the proposed project and asking them of any knowledge or information about tribal cultural resources they may have about the project area. One response was received by the San Pasqual Band of Mission Indians (San Pasqual) on October 8, 2020 indicating that the project area is within the boundaries of territory San Pasqual considers as its Traditional Use Area and therefore requested consultation. Several attempts were made to schedule the consultation meetings and no responses were received. Therefore, on November 4, 2020 City staff contacted San Pasqual via email recapping the project's requirements to monitor with an archaeologist and Native American monitor present during all grading activities and thereby concluded the consultation process. To date, no additional communication has been received.

Based on the NAHC Sacred Lands Files, SCIC records search, field survey, and Native American outreach, no tribal cultural resources are known to occur in the project area. However, there is potential for unknown buried tribal cultural resources to be present. Project construction could encounter unknown tribal cultural resources during ground-disturbing activities. If encountered, such resources could potentially be damaged or destroyed, resulting in a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project could result in a potentially significant impact to tribal cultural resources.

A Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Program as detailed in Section V of the Mitigated negative Declaration would be required. With implementation of the monitoring program, potential impacts on tribal cultural resources would be reduced to below a level of significance.

XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:

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

Implementation of the project would not interrupt existing sewer service to the project site or other surrounding development. The project is not anticipated to generate significant amount of wastewater. Wastewater facilities used by the project would be operated in accordance with the applicable wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). Existing sewer infrastructure exists within roadways surrounding the project site and adequate services are available to serve the project. Thus, impacts would be less than significant.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

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

facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

See XVII (a) above. Adequate services are available to serve the site and the project would not require the construction or expansion of existing facilities. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

☐
☐
☐
☒

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

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

☐
☐
☒
☐

The project does not meet the CEQA significance thresholds requiring the need for the project to prepare a water supply assessment. The existing project site currently receives water service from the City, and adequate services are available to serve the site without requiring new or expanded entitlements. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

☐
☐
☒
☐

Construction of the project would not adversely affect existing wastewater treatment services. Adequate services are available to serve the site without requiring new or expanded facilities. Impacts would be less than significant.

- f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?

☐
☐
☒
☐

The project would be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's disposal needs. Construction debris and waste would be generated from the site preparation, grading and construction of the park. All construction waste from the project site would be transported to an appropriate facility, which would have adequate capacity to accept the limited

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

amount of waste that would be generated by the project. Long-term operation of the proposed park is anticipated to generate typical amounts of solid waste associated with recreational uses. Furthermore, the project would be required to comply with the City's Municipal Code (including the Refuse and Recyclable Materials Storage Regulations (Municipal Code Chapter 14, Article 2, Division 8), Recycling Ordinance (Municipal Code Chapter 6, Article 6, Division 7), and the Construction and Demolition (C&D) Debris Deposit Ordinance (Municipal Code Chapter 6, Article 6, Division 6)) for diversion of both construction waste during the demolition phase and solid waste during the long-term, operational phase. Impacts are considered to be less than significant.

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

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

XX. WILDFIRE – Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The 2017 San Diego County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan (SDHMP) is the San Diego region's plan toward greater disaster resilience in accordance with section 322 of the Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000. The project would not conflict with the goals, objectives, and actions of the SDHMP. Per Action 1.D.6, High fire hazard areas shall have adequate access for emergency vehicles. The project site is located in a previously developed area with existing infrastructure and facilities currently serving the site. Additionally, the project would provide adequate access for emergency vehicles. Therefore, the project would not conflict with emergency response and would not substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan. Impacts would be less than significant.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of wildfire? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The project is located within an existing urban neighborhood surrounded by residential uses. Additionally, the project site does not contain any slopes and is generally flat, therefore, the project would not exacerbate wildfire risks. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The project is currently served by existing infrastructure which would service the site during and after construction. The project area has adequate fire hydrant services and street access. No new infrastructure is proposed to support the project that may exacerbate fire risk. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The project area is within developed urban neighborhood. The project would comply with the City's Landscape Regulations and Land Development Code. The project would not expose people or structures to significant risk from flooding or landslide as a result of runoff, post-fire instability, or drainage changes. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE –

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

As documented in this Initial Study, the project may have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, notably with respect to Biological Resources, Historical Resources (Archaeology), and Tribal Cultural Resources. As such, mitigation measures have been incorporated to reduce impacts to less than significant as outlined within the Initial Study.

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

CEQA Guidelines Section 15064(i) states that a Lead Agency shall consider whether the cumulative impact of a project is significant and whether the effects of the project are cumulatively considerable. The assessment of the significance of the cumulative effects of a project must, therefore, be conducted in connection with the effects of past projects, other current projects, and probable future projects. Cumulative environmental impacts are those impacts that by themselves are not significant, but when considered with impacts occurring from other projects in the vicinity would result in a cumulative impact. Related projects considered to have the potential of creating cumulative impacts in association with the project consist of projects that are reasonably foreseeable and that would be constructed or operated during the life of the project. The project would be located in a developed area that is largely built out. No other construction projects are anticipated in the immediate area of the project.

As documented in this Initial Study, the project may have the potential to degrade the environment as a result of Biological Resources, Historical Resources (Archaeology), and Tribal Cultural Resources impacts, which may have cumulatively considerable impacts when viewed in connection with the effects of other potential projects in the area. As such, mitigation measures have been identified to fully mitigate and reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Other future projects within the surrounding area would be required to comply with applicable local, State, and Federal regulations to reduce potential impacts to less than significant, or to the extent possible. As such, the project is not anticipated to contribute to potentially significant cumulative environmental impacts. Project impacts would be less than significant.

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

As discussed throughout this document, it is not anticipated that the construction and operation of the project would not cause environmental effects that would significantly directly or indirectly impact human beings. All impacts identified as being significant have been mitigated to below a level of significance. For this reason, all environmental effects fall below the thresholds established by the City of San Diego. Impacts would be less than significant.

INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST REFERENCES

I. Aesthetics / Neighborhood Character

- ☐ City of San Diego General Plan
- ☒ Community Plans: Otay Mesa-Nestor Community Plan

II. Agricultural Resources & Forest Resources

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

III. Air Quality

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

IV. Biology

- ☐ City of San Diego, Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP), Subarea Plan, 1997
- ☐ City of San Diego, MSCP, "Vegetation Communities with Sensitive Species and Vernal Pools" Maps, 1996
- ☒ City of San Diego, MSCP, "Multiple Habitat Planning Area" maps, 1997
- ☐ Community Plan - Resource Element
- ☐ California Department of Fish and Game, California Natural Diversity Database, "State and Federally-listed Endangered, Threatened, and Rare Plants of California," January 2001
- ☐ California Department of Fish and Game, California Natural Diversity Database, "State and Federally-listed Endangered and Threatened Animals of California," January 2001
- ☐ City of San Diego Land Development Code Biology Guidelines
- ☒ Site Specific Report:
 - Biological Technical Report, Southwest Neighborhood Park prepared by Maya Mazon, Engineering and Capital Project Department, dated August 10, 2020

V. Historical Resources

- ☐ City of San Diego Historical Resources Guidelines
- ☒ City of San Diego Archaeology Library
- ☐ Historical Resources Board List
- ☐ Community Historical Survey:
- ☒ Site Specific Report:
 - Southwest Neighborhood Park Archaeological Resources Report, prepared by Helix Environmental Planning, dated December 2018

VI. Geology/Soils

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

- ☒ Site Specific Report:
 - Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation Southwestern Park, prepared by Geocon incorporated, dated March 12, 2019
 - Update to Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation Southwestern Park, prepared by Geocon Incorporated, dated July 22, 2020

VII. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

- ☒ Site Specific Report: Climate Action Plan Consistency Checklist

VIII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

- ☒ San Diego County Hazardous Materials Environmental Assessment Listing
- ☐ San Diego County Hazardous Materials Management Division
- ☐ FAA Determination
- ☐ State Assessment and Mitigation, Unauthorized Release Listing, Public Use Authorized
- ☐ Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan
- ☐ Site Specific Report:

IX. Hydrology/Drainage

- ☐ Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM)
- ☐ Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), National Flood Insurance Program-Flood Boundary and Floodway Map
- ☐ Clean Water Act Section 303(b) list, http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/tmdl/303d_lists.html
- ☒ Site Specific Report:
 - Preliminary Drainage Study for Southwest Park prepared by Fuscoe Engineering dated June 25, 2020

X. Land Use and Planning

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

XI. Mineral Resources

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

XII. Noise

- ☒ City of San Diego General Plan
- ☐ Community Plan
- ☐ San Diego International Airport - Lindbergh Field CNEL Maps
- ☐ Brown Field Airport Master Plan CNEL Maps
- ☐ Montgomery Field CNEL Maps

- ☐ San Diego Association of Governments - San Diego Regional Average Weekday Traffic Volumes
- ☐ San Diego Metropolitan Area Average Weekday Traffic Volume Maps, SANDAG
- ☐ Site Specific Report:

XIII. Paleontological Resources

- ☒ City of San Diego Paleontological Guidelines
- ☐ Deméré, Thomas A., and Stephen L. Walsh, "Paleontological Resources City of San Diego," Department of Paleontology San Diego Natural History Museum, 1996
- ☒ Kennedy, Michael P., and Gary L. Peterson, "Geology of the San Diego Metropolitan Area, California. Del Mar, La Jolla, Point Loma, La Mesa, Poway, and SW 1/4 Escondido 7 1/2 Minute Quadrangles," *California Division of Mines and Geology Bulletin* 200, Sacramento, 1975
- ☐ Kennedy, Michael P., and Siang S. Tan, "Geology of National City, Imperial Beach and Otay Mesa Quadrangles, Southern San Diego Metropolitan Area, California," Map Sheet 29, 1977
- ☐ Site Specific Report:

XIV. Population / Housing

- ☐ City of San Diego General Plan
- ☐ Community Plan
- ☐ Series 11/Series 12 Population Forecasts, SANDAG
- ☐ Other:

XV. Public Services

- ☐ City of San Diego General Plan
- ☐ Community Plan

XVI. Recreational Resources

- ☐ City of San Diego General Plan
- ☐ Community Plan
- ☐ Department of Park and Recreation
- ☐ City of San Diego - San Diego Regional Bicycling Map
- ☐ Additional Resources:

XVII. Transportation / Circulation

- ☐ City of San Diego General Plan
- ☐ Community Plan:
- ☐ San Diego Metropolitan Area Average Weekday Traffic Volume Maps, SANDAG
- ☐ San Diego Region Weekday Traffic Volumes, SANDAG
- ☐ Site Specific Report:

XVIII. Utilities

- ☐ Site Specific Report:

XIX. Water Conservation

- ☐ Sunset Magazine, *New Western Garden Book*, Rev. ed. Menlo Park, CA: Sunset Magazine

XX. Water Quality

- ☐ Clean Water Act Section 303(b) list, http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/tmdl/303d_lists.html
- ☒ Site Specific Report:
 - Priority Development Project (PDP) Storm Water Quality Management Plan (SWQMP)
 - Southwest Park prepared by Fuscoe Engineering dated June 25, 2020



Project Location Map

Southwest Neighborhood Park– 1305 25th Street and 1362 27th Street
PROJECT NO. 654348



