PROJECT NO. 566657
SCH NO. N/A

SUBJECT: Saturn Boulevard: A request for a REZONE from AR-1-2 to RS-1-7, VESTING TENTATIVE, a COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT, and PLANNED DEVELOPMENT PERMIT for the demolition of a single-dwelling unit and detached accessory structures and the construction of an eighteen single-dwelling unit subdivision and two homeowner association (HOA) lots. HOA Lot A would contain an infiltration basin and HOA Lot B would be for the private drives. Various site improvements would also be constructed that include associated hardscape and landscape. An allowable deviation from the applicable development regulations with respect to street frontage is being requested. The developed 3.6-acre project site is located at 1695 Saturn Boulevard. The Otay Mesa Nestor Community Planning identifies the land use designation as Very Low Density (0-5 dwelling units per acre) and the zone as AR-1-2. The project site is also within the Airport Land Use Compatibility Overlay Zone (Brown Field), Airport Influence Area (Brown Field-Review Area 2), Federal Aviation Authority (FAA) Part 77 Noticing Area (NOLF Imperial Beach), Coastal Height Limitation Overlay Zone, the Coastal Overlay Zone (Non-Appealable Area 2), the Parking Impact Overlay Zone (Coastal). (LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Lot 8 of Vollers Addition to Oneota, According to Map thereof No. 518.) APPLICANT: Saturn Boulevard, LLC.

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): 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 (prior to permit issuance)

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

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

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

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

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

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

B. GENERAL REQUIREMENTS – PART II: Post Plan Check (After permit issuance/Prior to start of construction)

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

*Qualified Archaeologist, Qualified Native American Monitor*

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

**CONTACT INFORMATION:**

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

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

2. **MMRP COMPLIANCE:** This Project, Project Tracking System (PTS) No. 566657 and/or Environmental Document No. 566657 shall conform to the mitigation requirements contained in the associated Environmental Document and implemented to the satisfaction of the DSD's Environmental Designee (MMC) and the City Engineer (RE). The requirements may not be reduced or changed but may be annotated (i.e. to explain when and how compliance is being met and location of verifying proof, etc.). Additional clarifying information may also be added to other relevant plan sheets and/or specifications as appropriate (i.e., specific locations, times of monitoring, methodology, etc)

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

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

   Not Applicable

4. **MONITORING EXHIBITS:** All consultants are required to submit, to RE and MMC, a monitoring exhibit on a 11x17 reduction of the appropriate construction plan, such as site plan, grading, landscape, etc., marked to clearly show the specific areas including the LIMIT OF WORK, scope of that discipline's work, and notes indicating when in the construction schedule that work will be performed. When necessary for clarification, a detailed methodology of how the work will be performed shall be included.
Note: Surety and Cost Recovery - When deemed necessary by the Development Services Director or City Manager, additional surety instruments or bonds from the private Permit Holder may be required to ensure the long-term performance or implementation of required mitigation measures or programs. The City is authorized to recover its cost to offset the salary, overhead, and expenses for City personnel and programs to monitor qualifying projects.

5. **OTHER SUBMITTALS AND INSPECTIONS:** The Permit Holder/Owner’s representative shall submit all required documentation, verification letters, and requests for all associated inspections to the RE and MMC for approval per the following schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOCUMENT SUBMITTAL/INSPECTION CHECKLIST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Issue Area</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribal Cultural Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond Release</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Historical Resources (Archaeology)**

1. **Prior to Permit Issuance**

   **A. Entitlements Plan Check**

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

B. Letters of Qualification have been submitted to ADD

1. The applicant shall submit a letter of verification to Mitigation Monitoring Coordination (MMC) identifying the Principal Investigator (PI) for the project and the names of all persons involved in the archaeological monitoring program, as defined in the City of San Diego Historical Resources Guidelines (HRG). If applicable, individuals involved in the archaeological monitoring program must have completed the 40-hour HAZWOPER training with certification documentation.

2. MMC will provide a letter to the applicant confirming the qualifications of the PI and all persons involved in the archaeological monitoring of the project meet the qualifications established in the HRG.

3. Prior to the start of work, the applicant must obtain written approval from MMC for any personnel changes associated with the monitoring program.

II. Prior to Start of Construction

A. Verification of Records Search

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

2. The letter shall introduce any pertinent information concerning expectations and probabilities of discovery during trenching and/or grading activities.

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

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

   a. If the PI is unable to attend the Precon Meeting, the Applicant shall schedule a focused Precon Meeting with MMC, the PI, RE, CM or BI, if appropriate, prior to the start of any work that requires monitoring.

2. Identify Areas to be Monitored

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

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

2. When Monitoring Will Occur

   a. Prior to the start of any work, the PI shall also submit a construction schedule to MMC through the RE indicating when and where monitoring will occur.

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

III. During Construction

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

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

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

3. The PI may submit a detailed letter to MMC during construction requesting a modification to the monitoring program when a field condition such as modern disturbance post-dating the previous grading/trenching activities, presence of fossil formations, or when native soils are encountered that may reduce or increase the potential for resources to be present.

4. The archaeological and Native American consultant/monitor shall document field activity via the Consultant Site Visit Record (CSVIR). The CSVR's shall be faxed by the CM to the RE the first day of monitoring, the last day of monitoring, monthly (Notification of Monitoring Completion), and in the case of ANY discoveries. The RE shall forward copies to MMC.

B. Discovery Notification Process

1. In the event of a discovery, the Archaeological Monitor shall direct the contractor to temporarily divert all soil disturbing activities, including but not limited to digging, trenching, excavating or grading activities in the area of discovery and in
the area reasonably suspected to overlay adjacent resources and immediately notify the RE or BI, as appropriate.

2. The Monitor shall immediately notify the PI (unless Monitor is the PI) of the discovery.

3. The PI shall immediately notify MMC by phone of the discovery, and shall also submit written documentation to MMC within 24 hours by fax or email with photos of the resource in context, if possible.

4. No soil shall be exported off-site until a determination can be made regarding the significance of the resource specifically if Native American resources are encountered.

C. Determination of Significance

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

   a. The PI shall immediately notify MMC by phone to discuss significance determination and shall also submit a letter to MMC indicating whether additional mitigation is required.

   b. If the resource is significant, the PI shall submit an Archaeological Data Recovery Program (ADRP) which has been reviewed by the Native American consultant/monitor, and obtain written approval from MMC. Impacts to significant resources must be mitigated before ground disturbing activities in the area of discovery will be allowed to resume. **Note: If a unique archaeological site is also an historical resource as defined in CEQA, then the limits on the amount(s) that a project applicant may be required to pay to cover mitigation costs as indicated in CEQA Section 21083.2 shall not apply.**

   c. If the resource is not significant, the PI shall submit a letter to MMC indicating that artifacts will be collected, curated, and documented in the Final Monitoring Report. The letter shall also indicate that no further work is required.
IV. Discovery of Human Remains

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

A. Notification

1. Archaeological Monitor shall notify the RE or Bi as appropriate, MMC, and the PI, if the Monitor is not qualified as a PI. MMC will notify the appropriate Senior Planner in the Environmental Analysis Section (EAS) of the Development Services Department to assist with the discovery notification process.

2. The PI shall notify the Medical Examiner after consultation with the RE, either in person or via telephone.

B. Isolate discovery site

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

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

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

C. If Human Remains ARE determined to be Native American

1. The Medical Examiner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) within 24 hours. By law, ONLY the Medical Examiner can make this call.

2. NAHC will immediately identify the person or persons determined to be the Most Likely Descendent (MLD) and provide contact information.
3. The MLD will contact the PI within 24 hours or sooner after the Medical Examiner has completed coordination, to begin the consultation process in accordance with CEQA Section 15064.5(e), the California Public Resources and Health & Safety Codes.

4. The MLD will have 48 hours to make recommendations to the property owner or representative, for the treatment or disposition with proper dignity, of the human remains and associated grave goods.

5. Disposition of Native American Human Remains will be determined between the MLD and the PI, and, if:

   a. The NAHC is unable to identify the MLD, OR the MLD failed to make a recommendation within 48 hours after being 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 land owner 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 distribution THEN,

   c. In order 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 on the site;

      (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 CSVVR 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 MMC, or by 8AM of the next business day to report and discuss the findings as indicated in Section III-B, unless other specific arrangements have been made.

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

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

2. The RE, or BI, as appropriate, shall notify MMC immediately.

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

VI. Post Construction

A. Preparation and Submittal of Draft Monitoring Report

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

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

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

2. MMC shall return the Draft Monitoring Report to the PI for revision or, for preparation of the Final Report.

3. The PI shall submit revised Draft Monitoring Report to MMC for approval.

4. MMC shall provide written verification to the PI of the approved report.

5. MMC shall notify the RE or BI, as appropriate, of receipt of all Draft Monitoring Report submittals and approvals.

B. Handling of Artifacts

1. The PI shall be responsible for ensuring that all cultural remains collected are cleaned and catalogued.

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

3. The cost for curation is the responsibility of the property owner.

C. Curation of artifacts: Accession Agreement and Acceptance Verification
1. The PI shall be responsible for ensuring that all artifacts associated with the survey, testing and/or data recovery for this project are permanently curated with an appropriate institution. This shall be completed in consultation with MMC and the Native American representative, as applicable.

2. The PI shall include the Acceptance Verification from the curation institution in the Final Monitoring Report submitted to the RE or BI and MMC.

3. When applicable to the situation, the PI shall include written verification from the Native American consultant/monitor indicating that Native American resources were treated in accordance with state law and/or applicable agreements. If the resources were reinterred, verification shall be provided to show what protective measures were taken to ensure no further disturbance occurs in accordance with Section IV - Discovery of Human Remains, Subsection 5.

D. Final Monitoring Report(s)

1. The PI shall submit one copy of the approved Final Monitoring Report to the RE or BI as appropriate, and one copy to MMC (even if negative), within 90 days after notification from MMC that the draft report has been approved.

2. The RE shall, in no case, issue the Notice of Completion and/or release of the Performance Bond for grading until receiving a copy of the approved Final Monitoring Report from MMC which includes the Acceptance Verification from the curation institution.

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:

CITY OF SAN DIEGO
Mayor's Office
Councilmember Bry, District 1
Council Member Campbell, District 2
Council Member Ward, District 3
Council Member Montgomery, District 4
Council Member Kersey, District 5
Council Member Cate, District 6
Council Member Sherman, District 7
Council Member Moreno, District 8
Council President Gomez, District 9

Development Services Department
- EAS
- Planning Review
- Engineering Review
- Geology
- Transportation
- Landscaping
- DPM
- PUD- Water and Sewer

Planning Department
- Long Range Planning
- Facilities Financing
- Park and Recreation

Environmental Services Department
- Library - Government Documents (81)
- San Diego Central Library (81A)
- Otay Mesa-Nestor Branch Library (81 W)
- City Attorney (93C)

Other Organizations, Groups and Interested Individuals
- Historical Resources Board (87)
- Carmen Lucas (206)
- South Coastal Information Center (210)
- San Diego History Center (211)
- San Diego Archaeological Center (212)
- Save Our Heritage Organization (214)
- Ron Christman (215)
- Clint Linton (215 B)
- 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)
- Clint Linton, Ipay Nation of Santa Ysabel
- Lisa Cumper, Jamul Indian Village
- Jesse Pinto, Jamul Indian Village
- Otay Mesa Nestor Community Planning Group (228)
- California Department of Parks and Recreation (229)
- Theresa Acerro (230)
VII. RESULTS OF PUBLIC REVIEW:

( ) No comments were received during the public input period.

(X) 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 Initial Study material are available in the office of the Development Services Department for review, or for purchase at the cost of reproduction.

E. Shearer-Nguyen  
Senior Planner  
Development Services Department

March 18, 2019  
Date of Draft Report

May 6, 2019  
Date of Final Report

Analyst: M. Dresser

Attachments: Initial Study Checklist  
Figure 1: Location Map  
Figure 2: Site Plan
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  
Saturn Boulevard  
Project No. 566657

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, initial study, and the cultural resources survey report for the project, we concur with the impact analysis and mitigation measures described. However, we will also reassert our comments made on several recent City of San Diego DMNDs regarding explicitly allowing 3D scanning, at the discretion of the project archaeologist, of any non-burial-related items which will not be curated and preserved for future researchers.

Thank you for the opportunity to participate in the public review period of this DMND.

Sincerely,

Environmental Review Committee

cc: Brian F. Smith & Associates  
SDCAS President  
File

Comment noted. The letter from the San Diego County Archaeological Society expresses agreement with the impact analysis of the DMND and generally with the mitigation measures. Additionally, the letter requests that an additional requirement be included in the Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Program (MMRP) to allow 3D scans of any material deemed necessary by the archaeological consultant. The City maintains that the current MMRP is sufficient to reduce all impacts to below a level of significance. However, the City will consider the usefulness of including the additional requirement within the MMRP and at the same time the City would like additional discussions with the San Diego County Archaeological Society.
INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

1. Project title/Project number: Saturn Boulevard / 566657

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: 1695 Saturn Boulevard, San Diego, California 92154

5. Project Applicant/Sponsor’s name and address: Saturn Boulevard, LLC, 2770 Caulfield Drive, San Diego, California 92154

6. General/Community Plan designation: Residential / Very Low Density Residential (0-5 DU/AC)


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.):

A request for a REZONE from AR-1-2 to RS-1-7, a VESTING TENTATIVE MAP to subdivide one lot into twenty lots, a COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT and PLANNED DEVELOPMENT PERMIT for the demolition of a single dwelling unit and two detached accessory structures and the construction of eighteen single-dwelling units. The site would be subdivided into twenty lots, eighteen for single dwelling units, and two for homeowner association (HOA) lots. HOA Lot A would be 8,053-square-feet for an infiltration basin and HOA Lot B would be 25,822-square-feet for the private drives. The eighteen residential lots would range in size from 5,217 to 11,094-square feet. Various site improvements would also be constructed.

The Land Development Code Section §126.0602(b), allows projects to request deviations from applicable development regulations in accordance with a Planned Development Permit (PDP). Deviations requested by the project include:

- Street frontage - A deviation from San Diego Municipal Code (SDMC) Section 131.0431(b) Table 131-04D, to allow for lots 2-11 and 16 to have no frontage on a dedicated public right of way, where 50 feet of frontage is required.

The project landscaping has been reviewed by City Landscape staff and would comply with all applicable City of San Diego Landscape ordinances and standards. Drainage would be directed into appropriate storm drain systems designated to carry surface runoff, which has been reviewed and accepted by City Engineering staff. Ingress to the project site would be via Leon Avenue and Rimbey Avenue along a private drive. All parking would be provided on-site.

Grading would entail approximately 5,596 cubic yards of cut with a maximum cut depth of five feet.
9. Surrounding land uses and setting:

The 3.6-acre project site is located at 1695 Saturn Boulevard, and is developed with a single-dwelling unit and two detached accessory structures. The project site is situated generally north of Leon Avenue, east of Saturn Boulevard and south of Rimbey Avenue. Vegetation on-site is varied and consists of non-native landscaping flora. The project site is surrounded by existing residential uses and Godfrey G. Berry Elementary School. Topographically, the site elevations vary from approximately 45 to 50 feet with the highest elevations at the southwestern portion of the site and the lowest elevations in the northwestern portion of the site. In addition, the project site is located in a developed area currently served by existing public services and utilities.

The project site is designated Very Low Density (0-5 dwelling units per acre) and zoned AR-1-2 per the Otay Mesa Nestor Community Planning area. The project site is also within the Coastal Height Limitation Overlay Zone, the Coastal Overlay Zone (Non-Appealable Area 2), the Parking Impact Overlay Zone (Coastal), the Airport Influence Area (Review Area 2), and the Federal Aviation Administration Part 77 Noticing Area.

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

California American Water

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 engaged in consultation with the Iipay Nation of Santa Ysabel and the Jamul Indian Village, both traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area. Both tribes were notified via email on April 10, 2018 and both tribes responded within the 30-day formal notification period requesting consultation, which occurred on April 11, 2018. Both Native American Tribes concurred with staff's determination and the consultation process was concluded.

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.

☐ Aesthetics  ☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions  ☐ Population/Housing

☐ Agriculture and Forestry Resources  ☐ Hazards & Hazardous Materials  ☐ Public Services

☐ Air Quality  ☐ Hydrology/Water Quality  ☐ Recreation

☐ Biological Resources  ☐ Land Use/Planning  ☐ Transportation/Traffic

☒ Cultural Resources  ☐ Mineral Resources  ☐ Tribal Cultural Resources

☐ Geology/Soils  ☐ Noise  ☐ Utilities/Service System

☒ Mandatory Findings Significance

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

☐ The proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☒ Although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ The proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

☐ The proposed project MAY have a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect (a) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (b) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

☐ Although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or (MITIGATED) NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or (MITIGATED) NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.
EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact answer should be explained where it is based on project specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis.)

2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.

3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

4) “Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from “Earlier Analyses”, as described in (5) below, may be cross-referenced).

5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or (mitigated) negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
   a. Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
   b. Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
   c. Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less Than Significant With Mitigation Measures Incorporated", describe the mitigation measures that were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project’s environmental effects in whatever format is selected.

9) The explanation of each issue should identify:
   a. The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
   b. The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significant.
I. AESTHETICS – Would the project:

   a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

   There are no designated scenic vistas or view corridors identified in the Otay Mesa Nestor Community Plan. The project is compatible with the surrounding development. 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?

   The project is situated within a developed residential neighborhood. The project is not located within or adjacent to a state scenic highway and would not substantially damage such scenic resources. Therefore, no impacts would result.

   c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

   The project site is developed with a single-family dwelling unit and accessory structures and is generally surrounded by single-family residential units. The project is compatible with the surrounding development and permitted by the General Plan, community plan land use designations. The project would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings; therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

   d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

   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. Therefore, lighting installed with the project would not adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area, resulting in a less than significant lighting impact.

   The project would comply with Municipal Code Section 142.0730 (Glare Regulations) that require exterior materials utilized for proposed structures be limited to specific reflectivity ratings. The structures would consist of wood siding, wood shingles, adobe and concrete blocks, brick, stucco, concrete or natural stone. The project would have a less than significant glare impact.

II. AGRICULTURAL AND FOREST RESOURCES: In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The project is consistent with the General Plan and community plan's land use designation and is located within a developed residential neighborhood. As such, the project site does not contain, and is not adjacent to, any lands identified as Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as show on maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resource Agency. Therefore, the project would not result in the conversion of such lands to non-agricultural use. No impact would result.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refer to response II (a), above. There are no Williamson Act Contract lands on or within the vicinity of the project. The project is consistent with the General Plan and community plan's land use designation. The project would not conflict with any properties zoned for agricultural use or be affected by a Williamson Act Contract. Therefore, no impacts would result.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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))?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The project would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production. No designated forest land or timberland occur onsite as the project is consistent with the General Plan and community plan. No impacts would result.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

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? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

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

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

The project proposes a rezone from AR-1-2 (1 dwelling unit per acre) to RS-1-7 (0-5 dwelling units per acre). The site is designated in the General Plan as Residential and has a Community Plan land use designation of Very Low Density Residential with a density range of 0-<5 dwelling units per acre. The proposed rezone would result in a density consistent with the General Plan and the community plan land use designations. The project would construct eighteen single-family residences within a developed neighborhood with similar uses. Therefore, the project would be consistent at a sub-regional level with the underlying growth forecasts in the RAQS, and would not obstruct implementation of the RAQS. As such, no impacts would result.
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 City of San Diego grading permit 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. No mitigation measures are required.

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

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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Short-term (Construction)**

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

**Long-term (Operational)**

Typical long-term operational characteristics of the project are not associated with the creation of such odors nor anticipated to generate odors affecting a substantial number of people. The project would construct eighteen single-family residences. Residential dwelling units, in the long-term operation, are not typically associated with the creation of such odors nor are they anticipated to generate odors affecting a substantial number of 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?

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

c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are no wetlands or water of the United States on or near the site. No impacts would occur.

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?

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

e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

Refer to response IV (a), above. The project site is designated Very Low Density (0-5 dwelling units per acre) per the Otay Mesa Nestor Community Planning area. The project is located on a partially developed residential site and there are no local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources that apply to the project site. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

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

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource as defined in §15064.5?

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

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

The existing structures were built in 1929 and are proposed to be demolished. Therefore, in order to determine whether a significant impact to a potentially historic resource (built environment) would occur, qualified Plan-Historic staff reviewed a Historical Resources Research Report (1695 Saturn Boulevard) prepared by Moomjian 2017, which documented five historic structures within the project’s APE. Additional information consisting of building records, notice of completion, chain of title, and a photographic survey were also reviewed. City staff determined that the properties and/or structures are not individually designated resources and are not located within a designated historic district. Furthermore, the properties do not meet designation criteria as significant resources under any adopted criteria. No impact would result.

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. In addition, several previously recorded historic and prehistoric sites have been identified in the project vicinity. Based on this information, further review by City staff of archaeological maps in the Entitlements Division indicated that archaeological resources have been identified within close proximity of the project site. Based on this information, there is a potential for buried cultural resources to be impacted through implementation of the project. Therefore, an archaeological survey report was prepared by Brian F. Smith & Associates, Inc. (June 12, 2018), which included literature review, record search, Native American Consultation, and completion of a pedestrian field survey of the parcel along with a Native American monitor from Red Tail Monitoring & Research, Inc. on June 1, 2018, per the City's requirements. The results and conclusions of the technical report are summarized below.

A total of 12 previous investigations have been conducted within a one-half miler of the site, none of which have occurred within the project’s area of potential effect (APE). The records search did not indicate the presence of any previously recorded cultural resources within the APE; however, a total
of 11 recorded sites were identified within a one-half mile of the property. A Sacred Lands File search did not identify the presence of sacred sites or locations of religious or ceremonial importance with the search radius.

Both the Tiajuana and Otay rivers and associated drainages have been sources of fresh water for humans for thousands of years. The brackish water marsh at the mouth of the Tiajuana Slough to the west of the project has provided hunting and foraging resources for both prehistoric and historic peoples. The coastal mesas and wetland areas were important hunting and gathering areas for local human inhabitants in prehistoric times. Because the San Diego areas experienced an arid climate for at least 9,000 years, sources of fresh water attracted plants, animals, as well as humans who depended upon the plants, animals, and fresh water to survive. With the Tiajuana and Otay rivers representing large fresh water resources, the area became a focal point of human activity.

The pedestrian field survey was conducted by walking transects in 10-meter intervals across the project site. Although survey conditions were good, survey visibility conditions were limited (20 percent) due to existing structures, landscaping (non-native grasses and weeds), hardscape, modern trash, building materials, and piles of dirt. During the survey, particular attention was paid to areas with exposed ground surfaces; no archaeological artifacts or deposits were identified related to the prehistoric or historic land use. However, given the location of the project site's proximity to the Tiajuana and Otay rivers, which have resulted in cultural resources XXXXX FOUND WHAT, there is a potential for cultural resources to exist on the project site. Therefore, monitoring during ground-disturbing activities is required.

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?

According to the “Geology of the San Diego Metropolitan Area, California, La Jolla, 7.5 Minute Quadrangle Maps” (Kennedy and Peterson, 1975), the project site is underlain by Old Paralic Deposits, which has a high sensitivity level for fossil resource potential (paleontological resources). Grading operations would entail approximately 5,596 cubic yards of cut with a maximum cut depth of five feet. Therefore, the project would not exceed the City's Significance Determination Thresholds. No impact would result.

d) Disturb and human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?

The site is currently developed and has been modified in the past by the existing development. In the unlikely event remains are located, the project would comply with the Public Resources Code requirements for handling remains. Thus, no impacts to human remains would occur.
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS – Would the project:

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

      The closest known active faults are the Newport Inglewood, alt 1 and alt 2 and Rose Canyon Fault located approximately 3.25 miles from the project site. The site is not traversed by an active, potentially active, or inactive fault and is not within an Alquist-Priolo Fault Zone. The project would be required to comply with seismic requirement of the California Building Code, utilize proper engineering design and 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? □ □ ☑ □

      The site could be affected by seismic activity as a result of earthquakes on major active faults located throughout the Southern California area. Implementation of proper engineering design and utilization of standard construction practices, to be verified at the building permit stage, would reduce the potential impacts associated with seismic ground shaking to an acceptable level of risk. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

      iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? □ □ ☑ □

      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 very low risk of liquefaction due to the lack of shallow depth groundwater and the relatively dense underlying sedimentary materials. Therefore, risk of liquefaction would be considered low. The project would be required to comply with the California Building Code that would reduce impacts to people or structures to an acceptable level of risk. Implementation of proper engineering design and utilization of standard construction practices, to be verified at the building permit stage, would ensure that the potential for impacts from regional geologic hazards would remain less than significant.

      iv) Landslides? □ □ ☑ □

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?  

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

d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?  

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

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?  

31
The project site is located within an area that is already developed with existing infrastructure (i.e., water and sewer lines) and does not propose any septic system. In addition, the project does not require the construction of any new facilities as it relates to wastewater, as services are available to serve the project. No impact would occur.

VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS – Would the project:

a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment? □ □ √ □

Climate Action Plan

In December 2015, the City adopted a Climate Action Plan (CAP) that outlines the actions that the City will undertake to achieve its proportional share of state greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reductions. The purpose of the CAP Consistency Checklist is to, in conjunction with the CAP, provide a streamlined review process for proposed new development projects that are subject to discretionary review and trigger environmental review pursuant to CEQA.

The CAP Consistency Checklist is part of the CAP and contains measures that are required to be implemented on a project-by-project basis to ensure that the specified emissions targets identified in the CAP are achieved. Implementation of these measures would ensure that new development is consistent with the CAP’s assumptions for relevant CAP strategies toward achieving the identified GHG reduction targets. Projects that are consistent with the CAP as determined through the use of the CAP Consistency Checklist may rely on the CAP for the cumulative impact analysis of GHG emissions. Cumulative GHG impacts would be significant for any project that is not consistent with the CAP.

A project-specific CAP Consistency Checklist has been completed for the project, and its requirements would become conditions of project approval. As detailed in the project-specific CAP Consistency Checklist Step 1, the project is consistent with the allowed uses per the General Plan and Community Plan land use designations for the project site. Additionally, the Community Plan designation was used to determine the SANDAG Series 12 growth projections; therefore, the project is consistent with the SANDAG Series 12 growth projections. The project is consistent with the growth projections and land use assumptions used in the CAP. Furthermore, completion of Step 2 of the CAP Checklist demonstrates that the project would be consistent with applicable strategies and actions for reducing GHG emissions. This includes features consistent with the energy and water efficient building strategy, as well as bicycling, walking, transit, and land use strategies. Thus, the project is consistent with the CAP.

Based on the project’s consistency with the City’s CAP 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?

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

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Would the project:

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

Construction of the project may require the use of hazardous materials (fuels, lubricants, solvents, etc.), which would require proper storage, handling, use and disposal. Although minimal amounts of such substances may be present during construction of the project, they are not anticipated to create a significant public hazard. Once constructed, due to the nature of the project, the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials on or through the subject site is not anticipated. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

As noted in previous response VIII (a), no health risks related to the storage, transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials would result from the implementation of the project. The project would not be associated with such impacts. Therefore, 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?

Godfrey G. Berry Elementary School is located within a quarter mile from the project site. The project would not emit hazardous materials, substances, or waste. No impacts 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?

A search of potential hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 was completed for the project site. Several databases and resources were consulted including the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) EnviroStor database, the California
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

State Water Resources Control Board GeoTracker database, and other sources of potential hazardous materials sites available on the California EPA website. Based on the searches conducted, no contaminated sites are on or adjacent to the project site. Furthermore, the project site was not identified on the DTSC Cortese List. Therefore, the project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. No impacts would result.

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two mile of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

The project site is located within the Airport Influence Area (Review Area 2), as depicted in the adopted 2014 Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) for Brown Field Municipal Airport, the project would not result in a safety hazard residing in the project area. The project would comply with the noise, safety, and airspace protection compatibility requirements of Section 132.1510 through 132.1525 of the Land Development Code (LDC). 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 FAA per Section 132.1520(c). Additionally, the project site is not within a designated Accident Potential Zone (APZ) as identified in the Brown Field ALUCP and would, therefore, not subject people working or residing within the project area to a significant safety hazard.

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?

Refer to response VIII(e) above. The project site is not in proximity to any private airstrip. Therefore, no impacts will occur.

g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

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?
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The project is located within a developed residential neighborhood. There are no wildlands or other areas prone to wildfire within the vicinity of the project site. Therefore, the project would not expose people or structures to wildland fires. No impacts would occur.

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY - Would the project:

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? ☑ ☐ ☒ ☐

Potential impacts to existing water quality standards associated with the project would include minimal short-term construction-related erosion/sedimentation and no long-term operational storm water discharge. According to the City’s Storm Water Requirements Applicability Checklist, the project is considered to be a Priority Development Project and therefore required to prepare a Storm Water Quality Management Plan (REC Consultants, Inc. 2018) to identify and implement required best management practices (BMPs) for storm water pollutant control (BMP Design Manual Chapter 5, Part 1 of Storm Water Standards). The BMPs to be included in the project per the SWQMP consist of an on-site infiltration basin that would act as a combined pollutant control and hydromodification control. This requirement would be implemented during construction and post-construction, which have been reviewed by qualified staff and would be re-verified during the ministerial process. Adherence with the standards would ensure that water quality standards are not violated and also preclude a cumulatively considerable contribution to water quality; therefore, a less than significant impact would result.

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)? ☐ ☑ ☒ ☐

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? ☑ ☐ ☒ ☐

A site-specific Drainage Study was prepared by REC Consultants, Inc. (February 2018). Currently, the site has a drainage path located at the northeastern boundary of the project site and discharges at 6.46 cubic feet per second. Although the proposed project would use the same point of discharge as
the existing conditions, the project includes one biofiltration basin, which would treat runoff prior to discharging from the site. Under the developed condition, discharge would occur at 6.83 cubic feet per second; however, with the addition of the bioretention basin, the flow would be reduced to 5.08 cubic feet per second. Overall, the project would result in a net decrease of peak flow discharge from the project site by approximately 1.38 cubic feet per second.

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), the project would not significantly alter the overall drainage pattern for the site or area, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The project site is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area or any other known flood area. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area, structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?

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

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING – Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?

The project would construct eighteen single-family residences within a developed neighborhood of similar residential uses. The project is consistent with the General Plan, Community Plan's land use 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 not result in an impact related to physically dividing an established community.

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?

The project proposes a rezone from AR-1-2 (1 dwelling unit per acre) to RS-1-7 (0-5 dwelling units per acre). The site is designated in the General Plan as Residential and has a Community Plan land use designation of Very Low Density Residential with a density range of 0-<5 dwelling units per acre. The proposed rezone would result in a density consistent with the General Plan and the community plan land use designations. The project would construct eighteen single-family residences within a developed neighborhood with similar uses.

The Land Development Code Section §126.0602(b), allows projects to request deviations from applicable development regulations in accordance with a Planned Development Permit (PDP). Deviations requested by the project include:

1. Street frontage - A deviation from San Diego Municipal Code (SDMC) Section 131.0431(b) Table 131-04D, to allow for lots 2-11 and 16 to have no frontage on a dedicated public right of way, where 50 feet of frontage is required.
## Issue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Construction of the project would occur within an urbanized neighborhood with similar development. Furthermore, 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) 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?**

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

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

a) **Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?**

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

b) **Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?**

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

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

a) **Generation of, noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?**

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

For the long-term, typical noise levels associated with residential 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?

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?

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?

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. Implementation of these standard measures would reduce potential impacts from an increase in ambient noise level during construction to a less than significant level.

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan, or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport would the project expose people
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>residing or working in the area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are no airports located within or adjacent to the project site, with the closest airport being Brown Field Municipal Airport. The project site is located within the Airport Influence Area (Review Area 2), and FAA Part 77 Noticing Area, however, the risk of aircraft related noise exposure associated with the implementation of the project is considered low. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

- 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? ☐ ☐ ☑ ☒

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

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING – Would the project:

a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? ☐ ☑ ☒ ☐

The project site is located in an established residential neighborhood and is surrounded by similar development. The project site currently receives water and sewer service from the City and California American Water, and no extension of infrastructure to new areas is required. As such, the project would not induce substantial population growth in the area. Impacts would be less than significant.

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☑

The project would demolish an existing single-dwelling unit and detached accessory structures to construct eighteen single-dwelling residential units. Therefore, no such displacement would occur. No impacts would occur.

c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☑

See response XIII(b) above. No impacts would result.

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES

a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provisions of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Fire protection</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The project site is located in an urbanized and developed area where fire protection services are already provided. The project would not adversely affect existing levels of fire protection services to the area, and would not require the construction of new or expansion of existing governmental facilities. Impacts would be less than significant.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Police protection</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The project site is located in an urbanized and developed area within the City of San Diego where police protection services are already provided. The project would not adversely affect existing levels of police protection services or create significant new significant demand, and would not require the construction of new or expansion of existing governmental facilities. Impacts would be less than significant.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Schools</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The project would not affect existing levels of public services and would not require the construction or expansion of a school facility. The project site is located in an urbanized and developed area where public school services are available. The project would not significantly increase the demand on public schools over that which currently exists and is not anticipated to result in a significant increase in demand for public educational services. Impacts would be less than significant.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Parks</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The project site is located in an urbanized and developed area where City-operated parks are available. The project would not significantly increase the demand on existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities over that which presently exists and is not anticipated to result in a significant increase in demand for parks or other offsite recreational facilities. Impacts would be less than significant.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v) Other public facilities</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The project site is located in an urbanized and developed area where City services are already available. The project would not adversely affect existing levels of public services and not require the construction or expansion of an existing governmental facility. Impacts would be less than significant.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### XV. RECREATION

a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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?

|       | ☐                               | ☐                                                 | ☑                           | ☐         |

Refer to XV (a) above. The project does not propose recreation facilities nor require the construction or expansion of any such facilities.

### XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

- Would the project conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?

|       | ☐                               | ☐                                                 | ☑                           | ☐         |

The City of San Diego Traffic Impact Study Manual does not require a Traffic Impact Study for projects that conform to the community plan and generates less than 1,000 average daily trips (ADT). Per the City of San Diego’s Transportation General Manual, the trip rate for a single-family unit in an urbanized area is 10 ADT per dwelling unit. Therefore, the project is expected to generate approximately 180 ADT.

Based on the estimated increase of ADT from the project site when compared to existing land uses, the project is not expected to substantially adversely affect the performance of surrounding street segments and intersections. Therefore, the project would not conflict with the applicable City of San Diego Traffic Impact Study Manual.
Diego regulations establishing thresholds of effectiveness for the circulation system around the project site, resulting in a less than significant impact.

The project does not propose any changes to the public transit system, bicycle lanes, or pedestrian circulation. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

Refer to response XVI (a). The project would not generate substantial additional vehicular traffic and would not adversely affect any mode of transportation in the area. Therefore, the project would not result in conflict with any applicable congestion management program, level of service standards or travel demand measures. Impacts are considered less than significant, and no mitigation measures are not required.

c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?

The project is located within the Airport Influence Area (Review Area 2), as depicted in the adopted 2014 Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP). However, the project structures would not exceed 30 feet in height. Additionally, the project would not result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks in that the project would be consistent with the General Plan and land use plans. No impacts would result.

d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

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

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The project is consistent with the community plan designation and 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.

f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?

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

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

a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or

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.

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)).

Tribal Cultural Resources could potentially be impacted through project implementation. Therefore, to determine significance of the Tribal Cultural Resources, staff consulted with the Iipay Nation of Santa Isabel and the Jamul Indian Village, tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area in accordance with the requirements of Public Resources Code 21080.3.1. These tribes were notified via email on April 10, 2018 and both tribes responded within the 30-day formal notification period requesting consultation.

During the consultation, no additional Tribal Cultural Resources were identified. Both Tribes concurred with staff’s determination of archaeological monitoring with a Native American monitor present during ground-disturbing activities (as described in Section V(b), Cultural Resources), furthermore, supplementary mitigation measures were not necessitated; thus, concluding the consultation process.

Therefore, a Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Program, as detailed within Section V of the Mitigated Negative Declaration would be implemented. With implementation of the monitoring program, potential impacts on tribal cultural resources would be reduced to a less than significant level.

XVIII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?

b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

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?

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). California American Water would provide water service to the project site. 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.

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.
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?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The project does not meet the CEQA significance threshold of 500 residential units, requiring the need the preparation of a water supply assessment. The site currently receives water service from California American Water, and adequate services are available to serve the project 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?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 demolition of the existing single-family residence and accessory structures and construction of eighteen single-family residential units. All construction waste from the project site would be transported to an appropriate facility, which would have adequate capacity to accept the limited amount of waste that would be generated by the project. Long-term operation of the proposed residential unit is anticipated to generate typical amounts of solid waste associated with residential use. 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.
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.
c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

The demolition of the existing single-dwelling unit and construction of a new single-dwelling unit is consistent with the setting and with the use anticipated by the City. It is not anticipated that demolition or construction activities would create conditions that would significantly directly or indirectly impact human beings. Impacts would be less than significant.
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