NEGATIVE DECLARATION



THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO

Project No. 623199 SCH No.: N/A I.O. No. 24008104

SUBJECT: <u>63RD AND MONTEZUMA PDP/RZ/CPA</u>: The project proposes a COMMUNITY PLAN AMENDMENT (CPA), REZONE (RZ), and PLANNED DEVELOPMENT PERMIT (PDP) to

demolish three buildings and to allow the construction of a five-story, 52,350 square-foot, 38-unit multi-family residential building with roof deck, on a 0.43-acre site. The project site is in the RM-1-1 (Residential-Multiple Unit) Zone of the College Area Community Plan. The proposed rezone would change the existing zone from RM-1-1 (Residential-Multiple Unit) to RM-3-9 (Residential-Multiple Unit). The Community Plan Amendment proposes changing the land use designation from Low-Medium Residential (10-15 dwelling units per acre (du/ac) to Residential High (45-73 du/ac)). The project requires a PDP to allow deviations from certain regulations of the RM-3-9 zone and requests deviations for private storage, private open space, minimum driveway dimensions, and the maximum Floor-Area Ratio (FAR). The project site is located at 6253, 6262, and 6273 Montezuma Road and is within the College Area Community Plan, College Community Redevelopment Project, Parking Standards Transit Priority Area, Transit Priority Area, Parking Impact Overlay Zone (Campus Impact), Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone, Airport Land Use Compatibility Overlay Zone for Montgomery Field Airport (MFA), and the Airport Influence Area (MFA-Review Area 2). (Legal Description: Portions of Lots 192, 193, & 194 of Collwood Park Unit No. 2, in the City of San Diego, State of California, according to Map thereof No. 2495, filed in the office of the County Recorder of San Diego County. APN 467-171-33, 467-171-34, and 467-171-35.) Applicant: Joel Berman.

I. PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

See attached Initial Study.

II. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING:

See attached Initial Study.

III. DETERMINATION:

The City of San Diego has conducted an Initial Study and determined that the proposed project will not have a significant environmental effect 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:

None required.

VI. PUBLIC REVIEW DISTRIBUTION:

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

CITY OF SAN DIEGO

Councilmember Sean Elo-Rivera

Mayor's Office

Central Library

College-Rolando Branch Library

City Attorney's Office

Development Services

Development Project Manager

Environmental, Senior Planner

Permit Planner, Senior

Environmental, Associate Planner

Permit Planner, Associate Planner

Landscape Planner, Associate Planner

Transportation, Traffic Engineer

Plan-Historic, Senior Planner

Geology, Associate Engineering-Geologist

PUD-Water and Services

Fire-Plan Review

Planning Department

Long Range Planning

Facilities Financing

Park and Recreation

Environmental Services Department, Senior Planner

OTHER ORGANIZATIONS AND INTERESTED PARTIES

San Diego State University (SDSU), Facilities Planning and Management Director College Area Community Planning Board V.P. Business Affairs, SDSU Karen Ruggels, KLR PLANNING Sophia Del Mar English, JWDA Joel Berman (Applicant) Susan Schaffer Richard Drury Komalpreet Toor Stacey Oborne

VII. RESULTS OF PUBLIC REVIEW:

- (X) No comments were received during the public input period.
- () Comments were received but did not address the draft Mitigated Negative Declaration finding or the accuracy/completeness on the Initial Study. No response is necessary. The letters are attached.
- () Comments addressing the finding of the draft Mitigated Negative Declaration and/or accuracy or completeness of the Initial Study were received during the public input period. The letters and responses follow.

Copies of the draft Negative Declaration 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.

Jamie Kennedy, Senior Planner Development Services Department

May 19, 2021

Date of Draft Report

June 23, 2021 Date of Final Report

Analyst: R. Benally

Attachments:

Initial Study Checklist Figure 1 – Vicinity Map Figure 2 – Location Map Figure 3 – Site Plan Figure 4 – Fire Access Plan

Figure 5 – Proposed Roof Plan

Figure 6 – Building Elevations, North and East

Figure 7 – Building Elevations, South and West

Appendices:

Appendix A: Historical Resource Research Report Appendix B: Preliminary Geotechnical Report Appendix B1: Preliminary Geotechnical Evaluation Memorandum Appendix C: CAP Consistency Checklist Appendix D: Drainage Study Appendix E: Storm Water Quality Management Plan Appendix F: Noise Study Appendix F1: Noise Memorandum Appendix G: Waste Management Plan Appendix H: Air Quality Memorandum



INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

- 1. Project title/Project number: 63rd and Montezuma PDP/RZ/CPA / 623199
- Lead agency name and address: City of San Diego, 1222 First Avenue, MS-501, San Diego, California 92101
- 3. Contact person and phone number: Rhonda Benally / (619) 446-5468
- 4. Project location: 6253, 6263, and 6273 Montezuma Road, San Diego, California 92115
- 5. Project Applicant/Sponsor's name and address: Joel Berman, 1455 Frazee Road, San Diego, California, 92108
- 6. General Plan/Community Plan designation: The land use designation of the General Plan is Residential. The land use designation of the College Area Community Plan is Low/Medium Density Residential (10-15 dwelling units per acre).
- 7. Zoning: RM-1-1 (Residential—Multiple Unit) zone
- 8. Description of project (Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to, later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation.):

The project proposes a COMMUNITY PLAN AMENDMENT (CPA), REZONE (RZ), and PLANNED **DEVELOPMENT PERMIT (PDP)** to demolish three buildings totaling approximately 18,751 square feet and to allow the construction of a five-story, 52,350 square-foot, 38-unit multi-family residential building located at 6253, 6263, and 6273 Montezuma Road (See Figure 1, Vicinity Map, and Figure 2, Location Map). The multi-family residential building would be five stories in height and would provide 38 units, with four three-bedroom units and 34 four-bedroom units, two of which (or five percent of the total residential units) would be affordable housing units located off site (see Figure 3, Site Plan). The first level of the residential building would be 11,405 square-feet, the second level would be 11,465 square-feet, levels three and four would be 10,210 square-feet, and the fifth level would be 9,060 square-feet for a total of 52,350 square-feet. The project would also include a 2,070-squarefoot amenity and leasing area at the northeast portion of the first floor. The amenity space would offer office space, a conference room, a mail room, computers, and vending machines for residents and guests. Additionally, a 1,155 square-foot roof deck would provide a game room and lounge, with an open-space balcony for residents and guests to use. The building architecture would feature a variety of building materials, including smooth stucco, fiber cement, wood composite, concrete, and various applications of glass, metal, and aluminum.

By providing five percent of the base units as affordable housing to very-low-income households, the project is eligible for one incentive. This incentive would be utilized to exceed the allowed height limit of 56'-0", where the proposed structure would be 57'-6" in height.

The project proposes residential use in a Transit Priority Area, and as such, is not required to provide vehicle parking spaces pursuant to SDMC Table 142-05C, as long as it provides the required Transportation Amenities. In this case, according to SDMC Section 142.0528, the project has a

Transportation Amenity Score of six points. As such, the project is required to provide transportation amenities worth at least four points, as quantified by Land Development Manual Appendix Q, *Determining Transportation Amenities Required by the Parking Standards Transit Priority Area Regulations*. The project is providing the installation of a bus shelter, which is valued at five points, as well as the posting of transit and rideshare information, which is valued at one point. Transportation amenities proposed by the project total the equivalent of six points, which is in excess of the required four points. Therefore, the project is in compliance with SDMC Section 142.0528. Five motorcycle parking spaces and 24 bicycle parking spaces would be provided on the project site at the street level, with driveway access from 63rd Street. Pedestrian access to the site would be from existing sidewalks along Montezuma Road and 63rd Street.

Project landscaping includes a variety of drought-tolerant trees, shrubs, and groundcover. The tree palette includes shade trees and shrubs outside of the main entrance (such as sweetshade and bulbine lily), street trees along Montezuma Road (including gold medallion), and additional shade trees (gold medallion, crape myrtle coral pink, and pink dawn chitalpa) along the perimeter of the project site. Shrubbery would include drought-tolerant shrubs (such as cape rush, red star dracaena, silver dollar plant, and dwarf myrtle) around the exterior of the building, as well as around the site's perimeter.

The project also includes two courtyards along Montezuma Road—a courtyard of 790 square- feet and a courtyard of 1,100 square- feet. These courtyards would provide breaks to the building elevation along Montezuma Road and provide enhanced landscaping and an open space area along this roadway. The project would also have a patio in the northeast corner of the site.

Project implementation would involve 50 cubic yards (CY) of cut at a maximum depth of cut of 5' feet and 50 CY of fill at maximum height of 5 feet. No import or export would be required.

Discretionary actions required for the project include an Amendment to the College Area Community Plan to change the current land use designation from Low/Medium Density Residential (10-15 dwelling units per acre (du/ac)) to Residential High (45-73 du/ac) and a rezone to change from RM-1-1 zone (Residential-Multiple Unit), allowing one dwelling unit per 3,000 square feet to RM-3-9 zone (Residential-Multiple Unit), allowing one dwelling unit per 600 square feet). The project also requires a Planned Development Permit (PDP) to allow deviations from certain regulations of the RM-3-9 zone, as discussed below.

The project would comply with all zoning and development regulations of the RM-3-9 zone, with the exception of private storage, private open space, minimum driveway width, maximum floor area ratio, and the maximum structure height. The project would utilize an affordable housing incentive to deviate from the maximum building height. The project also requests the following deviations for private storage, private open space, minimum driveway width, and the maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR).

<u>Private Storage</u> Private storage is regulated by SDMC Section 131.0454, which states that each residential unit is to have a fully enclosed personal storage area. The project proposes that 39 percent of the units would have storage located in storage rooms on levels two through five. A deviation to provide less than the required private storage is proposed.

<u>Useable Private Exterior Open Space</u> SDMC Section 131.0445(c) requires that 75 percent of the dwelling units be provided with at least 60 square-feet of usable, private, exterior open space. The project does not include private exterior open space. Instead, the project would provide for increased common exterior open space in lieu of private exterior open space (8,220 square feet provided where 950 square feet is required).

<u>Minimum Driveway Width</u> Table 142-05M of the SDMC requires a minimum driveway width of 20 feet; the project's driveway width would be 10 feet. The project's driveway is to access motorcycle parking spaces only, and thus the proposed 10-foot width is appropriate for two-way circulation.

<u>Floor-Area Ratio</u> Per Table 131-04G of the SDMC, the maximum allowed FAR in the RM-3-9 zone is 2.70, where the proposed FAR is 2.79.

The project proposes to rezone the project site from RM-1-1 (Residential-Multiple Unit) to RM-3-9. The purpose of the RM zones is to provide for multiple dwelling unit development at varying densities. The RM-3-9 zone, specifically, is intended to accommodate medium density multiple dwelling units with limited commercial uses and permits a maximum density of one dwelling unit for each 600 square-feet of lot area (or 73 dwelling units per acre). In order to evaluate the most intense use that could occur under the RM-3-9 zone should the proposed multi-family project not proceed after project approvals, a most-intense project use scenario is evaluated in this Negative Declaration (ND). The most intense development would be what could be developed ministerially under the proposed zone once adopted, if the proposed development, hereby referred to as "63rd and Montezuma," should not proceed.

Because the RM zones allow limited commercial uses in addition to multi-family residential uses and due to the site's location and size, for purposes of evaluating environmental impacts, the most intense development of the project site is assumed to be a mixed-use development with 32 multi-family residential units (the maximum allowed for the project site with the proposed RM-3-9 zone), and 12,657 square-feet of local-serving commercial uses. The local-serving uses could include food, beverage, and groceries; convenience stores; and personal services. Eating and drinking establishments are not permitted in the RM-3-9 zone. The most intense development of the project site is required to provide parking for the services provided. Parking for the 12,657 square-feet of local-serving commercial uses would be provided at a range of a minimum of 2.1 spaces per 1,000 square feet to a maximum of 6.5 spaces per 1,000 square feet, resulting in the need for 27 to 83 parking spaces.

The development regulations of the SDMC and the Community Plan provide the parameters for development on the site that could occur through ministerial approval. Based on the regulations of the RM-3-9 zone and the College Area Community Plan, ministerial development on the site would be required to adhere to various development regulations, including:

- Maximum structure height of 56'-0" feet.
- 10-foot minimum front setback, 20-foot standard front setback Up to 50 percent of the width of the building envelope may observe the minimum 10-foot front setback, provided the remaining percentage of the building envelope width observes the standard 20-foot setback.

- Five-foot minimum side setback.
- 10-foot minimum street side setback The minimum street side setback is 10 feet of 10 percent of the premises' width, whichever is greater; up to 50 percent of the building façade may encroach up to five feet into the required street side yard.
- Five-foot minimum rear setback.
- Maximum FAR of 2.70.
- Accessory use of no more than 25 percent of the gross floor area.
- Adherence to resident storage requirements Each dwelling unit shall have a fully enclosed, personal storage area outside the unit that is at least 240 cubic feet with a minimum seven-foot horizontal dimension along one place.
- Adherence to private exterior open space requirements At least 75 percent of the dwelling units shall be provided with at least 60 square feet of usable, private, exterior open space abutting the unit with a minimum dimension of six feet.
- Adherence to common exterior open space requirements pursuant to SDMC §131.0456.
- Adherence to ground-floor height requirements Commercial uses on the ground floor shall be a minimum height of 13 feet, measured from floor to floor.
- Adherence to supplemental requirement, as applicable, that when the ground floor of a building is used for parking and the parking is adjacent to a required yard, the parking area must be screened by a minimum six-foot-high fence or six-foot-high landscaping. A pedestrian entry to the building from each street must be provided.
- Refuse and recyclable storage requirements pursuant to SDMC §142.0805.
- 9. Surrounding land uses and setting: Briefly describe the project's surroundings:

The 0.43-acre project site is located at 6253, 6263, and 6273 Montezuma Road, San Diego, California. The project site is situated south of Montezuma Road and west of 63rd Street. The site currently has three single-family residential dwelling units that would be demolished. Single-story single-family residential developments occur immediately to the northeast, east, and south; a five-story multi-family residential development borders the project site to the west; and institutional uses (SDSU) are located to the north and northwest. Regional access to the site is provided by Interstate (I-8) Freeway, located approximately one mile north of the project site, and I-15 Freeway, located approximately and 63rd Street immediately east of the project site. The nearest bus stop is located immediately adjacent to the northwest of the project site, on the corner of Montezuma Road and 63rd Street. The nearest trolley station is the SDSU Transit Center, located approximately 0.4-mile to the northwest of the project site.

The site's topography is generally flat. Elevations range from approximately 465 feet above mean sea level (AMSL) in the southeast corner of the site to approximately 460 feet AMSL in the northwest corner.

The project site is located in the College Area Community Plan, College Community Redevelopment Project, Parking Standards Transit Priority Area, Transit Priority Area, Parking Impact Overlay Zone (Campus Impact), Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone, Airport Land Use Compatibility Overlay Zone for Montgomery Field Airport (MFA), and Airport Influence Area (MFA-Review Area 2). The site is located in a developed area currently served by existing public services and utilities. 10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.):

NONE REQUIRED.

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

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.

In accordance with the requirements of Assembly Bill (AB) 52, the City of San Diego initiated AB 52 Notification on May 7, 2020 to lipay Nation of Santa Ysabel and Jamul Indian Village, and on January 5, 2021 to San Pasqual Band of Mission Indians. EAS received email correspondence by Tribal Representatives that they had no further concerns for potential impacts to Tribal Cultural Resources, and consultation was closed on this project.

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	Hazards & Hazardous Materials	Public Services
Agriculture and Forestry Resources	Hydrology/Water Quality	Recreation
Air Quality	Land Use/Planning	Transportation/Traffic
Biological Resources	Mineral Resources	Tribal Cultural Resources
Cultural Resources	Noise	Utilities/Service System
Energy	Paleontological Resources	Wildfire
Geology/Soils	Population/Housing	Mandatory Findings
Greenhouse Gas Emissions		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.
- Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant.
 "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from "Earlier Analyses", as described in (5) below, may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or (mitigated) negative declaration. *Section 15063(c)(3)(D).* In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a. Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b. Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c. Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less Than Significant With Mitigation Measures Incorporated", describe the mitigation measures that were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
- 7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
- 9) The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a. The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b. The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significant.

	Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I)	AESTHETICS – Would the project:				
	 a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? 				\boxtimes

No public views, scenic vistas and/or scenic corridors are designated per the College Area Community Plan exist on the site or in the vicinity. Neither the proposed 63rd and Montezuma project nor development of the site under the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone would result in a substantially adverse impact on a scenic vista. No impacts would result.

b) S re li o b	Substantially damage scenic esources, including but not imited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic ouildings within a state scenic		\boxtimes
b h	highway?		

The project site has been graded and previously disturbed by prior development. Due to the previous existing development, there are no scenic resources (trees, rock outcroppings, or historic buildings) located on, near, or adjacent to the project site, and is not located within a State scenic highway. The nearest State scenic highway is State Route 163, located approximately eight miles west of the project site. The project would not result in the physical loss, isolation, or degradation of a community identification symbol or landmark, as none are identified by the City of San Diego General Plan or College Area Community Plan as occurring in the project vicinity. Neither the proposed 63rd and Montezuma project nor development of the site with the most intense use that could occur under the proposed RM-3-9 zone would result in substantial damage to scenic resources. No impacts would result.

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

The multi-family residential development is compatible with the surrounding existing development and urban neighborhood. The project proposes demolition of three existing buildings, and the construction of a five-story, 52,350-square-foot, multi-family residential development. Mostly one-story residential developments surround the project site, with a five-story multi-family residential development bordering the project site to the west, and institutional uses (San Diego State University (SDSU)) located nearby to the north and northwest. The project site is currently zoned RM-1-1, a low-density residential zone. The majority of surrounding development is zoned RS-1-7 (Residential Single-Unit), which allows single-unit residential units. Developments to the west include zones such as CN-1-2 (Commercial Neighborhood), RM-3-9 (Residential Multi-family), and RM-4-10, which show a transition to increased density (up to one dwelling unit per 400 square feet).

Project architecture would not result in degrading the existing visual character or quality of the site or the surrounding neighborhood. The building architecture would feature a variety of building materials, including smooth stucco, fiber cement, wood composite, concrete, and various applications of glass, metal, and aluminum (see Figure 6, *Building Elevations, North and East*, and Figure 7, *Building Elevations, South and West*). Bulk and scale would be compatible with the surrounding community, which features a variety of single-story single-family residential developments, as well as a five-story multi-family residential

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

development bordering the project site to the west and institutional uses (SDSU) located to the north and northwest.

In addition, the project would include two courtyards along Montezuma Road – a courtyard of 790 square feet and a courtyard of 1,100 square feet. These courtyards provide interruption to the building elevation along Montezuma Road and provide enhanced landscaping and an open area along this arterial roadway that is the community interface for the project. Along the majority of the Montezuma Road frontage, a non-contiguous sidewalk with a double row of trees would enhance the pedestrian environment. The landscaped parkway includes golden medallion canopy trees and bulbine lily with bark mulch. Between the sidewalk and building face, slender sledge groundcover, as well as silver dollar plant, cassa blue flax lily, and bulbine lily, would be planted. Sweetshade trees and red star dracaena would provide accent to the entry to the public courtyard. At the corner of 63rd Street and Montezuma Road, an expanded patio space, with articulated paving, red crape myrtle, gold medallion tree, and lilies, cape rush, and bark mulch would be provided in proximity to the existing bus stop. Pink crape myrtles would provide seasonal interest along the western elevation; a pink dawn chitalpa would provide accent to the southern entry lobby. Landscaping along the western and southern elevations would also include variegated dwarf myrtle and bark mulch for visual continuity with landscaping at other elevations of the project. Architectural treatments along Montezuma Road would include large storefront glazing windows and varied materials to create visual interest, such as smooth stucco and fiber cement siding in a light neutral tone, wood composite panels, board-formed concrete, metal trim and gates/doors, glass balcony guardrails, and accent painting. These architectural treatments and materials would be utilized on the remaining elevations. A glass window wall system would allow for views through the building from the north to south elevations, further breaking up the building's bulk.

A rooftop lounge would be provided on the building corner at the northeast area of the site, accented with outdoor seating and a metal-trimmed overhang. This fifth-floor amenity space has an interior portion and exterior portion. The interior portion is meant to be used as a lounge and co-working space for residents. The exterior patio area gives residents an opportunity to study and socialize outside in a less formal setting. The exterior patio is covered by an extended roof element with planters along the wall to add lightness with the added vegetation. The canopy creates protection from the sun and breaks up the massing when looking east. The amenity spaces placed on the east elevation create visual interest. The various amenity spaces provided gives tenants options for both active and more quiet/private spaces, creating a comfortable living environment for the residents.

There is no single or common architectural theme that applies to the whole of the project surroundings. A wide array of architectural styles dominates the College Area due to an absence of design standards and minimal landscaping. As such, the project would not have an architectural style or use building materials in stark contrast with adjacent developments of a single or common architectural theme. The landscape design for the project would enhance the proposed building by softening the connection of the building to the site and providing landscaping as a visual buffer where needed. The project would integrate an extensive landscape palette and would be constructed with high quality materials and architectural elements, as described above. The project would not degrade the existing character or quality of the site or its surroundings.

The project proposes a rezone from the RM-1-1 to the RM-3-9 zone. The most intense development of the project site is assumed to be a mixed-use development consisting of 32-multi-family residential units, and 12,657 square-feet of local-serving commercial uses. The local-serving uses could include food, beverage, and groceries; convenience sales; and personal services. Based on the regulations of the RM-3-9 zone and

Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated

 \square

Less Than Significant Impact

 \boxtimes

No Impact

the College Area Community Plan, development ministerially on the site would be required to adhere to various development regulations (such as maximum structure height, guidance on frontage and setbacks, lot coverage, and floor-area-ratio) to ensure development is visually compatible with the surrounding neighborhood and would not result in a significant adverse impact to the existing visual character of the surrounding neighborhood.

Neither the 63rd and Montezuma project nor development under the most intense use allowed in the proposed RM-3-9 zone would significantly alter the natural landform. The site has been previously graded and developed. The site and surrounding areas are relatively flat and void of landform variations. Development of the project site would not disturb steep hillsides, create manufactured slopes higher than ten feet, or result in a change in the elevation of steep hillsides. Neither the proposed 63rd and Montezuma project nor development of the site under the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone would result in a substantially adverse impact on the visual character and quality of the site or the surrounding area. 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 area is in a neighborhood that has a mix of uses that already include several lighting sources, such as streetlights and building signage. Other sources of light in the vicinity include: homes, commercial uses, parking, and security lighting.

Landscaping and architectural features associated with the proposed project may be illuminated. Additional lighting may be provided in pedestrian areas to provide security. Similarly, development under the most intense use that could occur in the proposed RM-3-9 zone may add lighting. However, new lighting would not create substantial light that would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area. Lighting would be regulated by compliance with Section 142.0740 of the City of San Diego Land Development Code. Glare would be avoided in accordance with Section 142.0730 of the City of San Diego Land Development Code. No more than 50 percent of any single elevation of the building's exterior would be built with a material with a light reflectivity greater than 30 percent. Additionally, the project would not shed substantial light onto adjacent, light-sensitive property or emit a substantial amount of ambient light into the nighttime sky. With the exception of safety lighting within pedestrian circulation areas and illuminated signage, all project lighting would be internal to the building and this lighting would not be shed onto surrounding developments. Adherence to the Land Development Code ensures that project impacts relative to lighting and glare would not occur.

Neither the proposed 63rd and Montezuma project nor development of the site under the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone would result in new sources of light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
 a) Converts Prime Farmlar Unique Farmland, or Fa of Statewide Importanc (Farmland), as shown or maps prepared pursuar Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of California Resources Ag non-agricultural use? 	nd, rmland e n the nt to the the ency, to			

The project site is classified as Urban and Built Up Land on the most recent Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP) map, does not contain any forest land as defined by Public Resources Code Section 12220(g), and does not contain any active agricultural operations. The project would not result in the conversion of prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of statewide importance. No impacts would result.

b)	Conflict with existing zoning for		
	agricultural use, or a Williamson		\boxtimes
	Act Contract?		

Refer to II. A), above. The project would not affect any properties zoned for agricultural use or affected by a Williamson Act Contract, as there are none within the project vicinity. Agricultural land is not present on the site or in the general vicinity of the site. No impacts would result.

c)	Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 1220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section		
	51104(g))?		

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

d)	Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to		\boxtimes
	non-forest use?		

Refer to II. C), above. Surrounding land uses are built out and no forest land is present. No impacts would result.

e)	Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could		
	to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-		\bowtie
	forest use?		

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

Refer to II. a) -d), above. No impacts 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 International Interna

An Air Quality Memorandum was prepared by Birdseye Planning Group, December 2020 that is included in Appendix H. The project site is located in the San Diego Air Basin (SDAB) and is under the jurisdiction of the San Diego Air Pollution Control District (SDAPCD) and the California Air Resources Board (CARB). Both the State of California and the Federal government have established health-based Ambient Air Quality Standards (AAQS) for the following six criteria pollutants: carbon monoxide (CO); ozone (O₃); nitrogen oxides (NOx); sulfur oxides (SOx); particulate matter up to 10 microns in diameter (PM₁₀); and lead (Pb). Ozone is formed by a photochemical reaction between NOx and volatile organic compounds (VOCs). Thus, impacts from O₃ are assessed by evaluating impacts from NOx and VOCs. A new increase in pollutant emissions determines the impact on regional air quality as a result of a proposed project. The results also allow the local government to determine whether a proposed project would deter the region from achieving the goal of reducing pollutants in accordance with the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) in order to comply with Federal and State AAQS.

The SDAPCD and San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) are responsible for developing and implementing the clean air plan for attainment and maintenance of the ambient air quality standards in the SDAB. The County Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) was initially adopted in 1991 and is updated on a triennial basis (most recently in 2009). The RAQS outlines the SDAPCD's plans and control measures designed to attain the State air quality standards for O₃. The RAQS relies on information from the 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 information from CARB and SANDAG, including projected growth in the County, mobile, area, and all other source emissions to project future emissions and determine from that the strategies necessary for the reduction of stationary source emissions through regulatory controls. Projects that propose development that is consistent with the growth anticipated by the General Plan is consistent with the SIP, AQMP, and RAQS.

The project proposes redevelopment of the project site with 38 multi-family units. Additionally, the project proposes a rezone of the site from the current RM-1-1 zone to RM-3-9, which could allow a more intense development of the project site. The most intense development of the site is assumed to be a mixed-use development with 32 multi-family residential units and 12,657 square feet of local-serving commercial uses.

The project, as well as development of the site with the most intense use under the proposed RM-3-9 zone, would not induce growth, as it would not open up a new area for development, but rather would provide infill redevelopment in an established community. The increased density proposed by the project and what could occur under the most intense use with the proposed RM-3-9 zone would be consistent with multi-family projects in the area and provide housing in proximity to SDSU. The additional housing would reduce vehicle miles travelled to commute from locations farther than the project site is to SDSU. Further, any commercial uses that could occur under the RM-3-9 zone would be intended to serve building residents and people living and working in the area.

Overall, the proposed 63rd and Montezuma project or development of the site under the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone would reduce vehicle trips and assist in addressing demand for housing in proximity to the SDSU campus. The project or development of the project site under the most intense use that could occur with the RM-3-9 zone would be consistent with the SIP, AQMP and RAQS. The 63rd and Montezuma project and development of the site under the most intense use that could occur with the consistent at a sub-regional level with the underlying growth forecasts in the RAQS and would not obstruct implementation of the RAQS. Impacts would be less than significant.

b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

The San Diego Air Basin (SDAB) is considered a non-attainment under Federal standards for O_3 (8-hour standard). The SDAB is in attainment for the State and Federal standards for nitrogen dioxide, carbon monoxide, sulfur dioxide, and lead.

The San Diego Air Pollution Control District (SDAPCD) has established thresholds in Rule 20.2 for new or modified stationary sources. With the exception of Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs) and PM_{2.5} thresholds, the City of San Diego screening quantities shown in the CEQA Significance Determination Thresholds, Table A-2, incorporate screening level thresholds from Rule 20.2 for use in air quality reports and for determining CEQA air quality impacts. The City does not show a standard for PM_{2.5} but does include a threshold for Reactive Organic Gas/Volatile Organic Compounds (ROG/VOC) emissions. Collectively, the standards shown in Table A-2 of the City's 2016 CEQA Determination Thresholds and the PM_{2.5} threshold shown in Table 20.2-1 of SDAPCD Rule 20.2, are used herein to determine whether project emissions would cause a significant air quality impact. The construction and operational emission thresholds for pollutants evaluated are as follows:

- Carbon Monoxide (CO) 550 pounds/day;
- Nitrogen Oxides (NOx) 100 pounds/day;
- Particulate Matter (PM10) 100 pounds/day;
- Particulate Matter (PM2.5) 67 pounds/day;
- Sulfur Oxides (SOx) 250 pounds/day; and
- Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs)/Reactive Organic Gases (ROGs) 137 pounds/day.

Construction Emissions

Project construction would generate temporary air emissions. These impacts are associated with fugitive dust (PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}) from soil disturbance and exhaust emissions (NOx and CO) from heavy construction vehicles. Site preparation and grading would involve the greatest concentration of heavy equipment use and the highest potential for fugitive dust emissions. The project would be required to comply with SDAPCD Rules 52 and 54 which identify measures to reduce fugitive dust and is required to be implemented at all construction sites located within the SDAB. In addition, LDC §142.0710, Air Contaminant Regulations, states that air contaminants that endanger human health, cause damage to vegetation or property, or cause soiling, shall not be permitted to emanate beyond the boundaries of the premises upon which the use emitting the contaminants is located.

Therefore, the following conditions, which are required to reduce fugitive dust in compliance with SDAPCD Rules 52 and 54, would apply to the project, as well as development that could occur under the most intense use with the proposed RM-3-9 zone, during site preparation and grading phases of construction. These conditions would also ensure compliance with LDC §142.0710.

- 1. Minimization of Disturbance. Construction contractors should minimize the area disturbed by clearing, grading, earth moving, or excavation operations to prevent excessive amounts of dust.
- 2. Soil Treatment. Construction contractors should treat all graded and excavated material, exposed soil areas and active portions of the construction site, including unpaved on-site roadways to minimize fugitive dust. Treatment shall include, but not necessarily be limited to, periodic watering, application of environmentally safe soil stabilization materials, and/or roll compaction as appropriate. Watering shall be done as often as necessary, and at least twice daily, preferably in the late morning and after work is done for the day. Note it was assumed watering would occur twice daily for modeling purposes.
- 3. Soil Stabilization. Construction contractors should monitor all graded and/or excavated inactive areas of the construction site at least weekly for dust stabilization. Soil stabilization methods, such as water and roll compaction, and environmentally safe dust control materials shall be applied to portions of the construction site that are inactive for over four days. If no further grading or excavation operations are planned for the area, the area shall be seeded and watered until landscape growth is evident, or periodically treated with environmentally safe dust suppressants, to prevent excessive fugitive dust.
- 4. No Grading During High Winds. Construction contractors should stop all clearing, grading, earth moving, and excavation operations during periods of high winds (20 miles per hour or greater, as measured continuously over a one-hour period).
- 5. Street Sweeping. Construction contractors should sweep all on-site driveways and adjacent streets and roads at least once per day, preferably at the end of the day, if visible soil material is carried over to adjacent streets and roads.

Construction is assumed to begin in mid-2021 and be completed in late 2022 for the proposed 63rd and Montezuma project. A similar 14- to18-month construction schedule is also assumed for development of the site under the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone. Table 1a, *Estimated Maximum Daily Construction Emissions – Proposed Project*, summarizes the estimated maximum daily

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

emissions of pollutants occurring during the construction period for the proposed project. Table 1b, *Estimated Maximum Daily Construction Emissions – Most Intense Use Under Proposed RM-3-9 Zone,* shows the construction emissions for the most intensive development scenario.

As shown in Tables 1a and 1b, construction of the proposed 63rd and Montezuma project or development of the site under the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone would not exceed the SDAPCD regional construction emission thresholds for daily emissions. Thus, project construction or development of the site under the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone would not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.

Construction Dhoos	Maximum Emissions (lbs/day)						
construction Phase	ROG	NOx	со	SOx	PM10	PM2.5	
2021 Maximum lbs/day	18.3	39.7	15.6	0.08	4.7	2.3	
City of San Diego Screening Thresholds	137	100	550	250	100	67	
Threshold Exceeded 2021	No	No	No	No	No	No	
Threshold Exceeded 2022	No	No	No	No	No	No	

 Table 1a

 Estimated Maximum Daily Construction Emissions – Proposed Project

Table 1b Estimated Maximum Daily Construction Emissions – Most Intense Use Under Proposed RM-3-9 Zone

Construction Phase	Maximum Emissions (lbs/day)						
construction Phase	ROG	NOx	со	SOx	PM10	PM2.5	
2021 Maximum lbs/day	2.0	28.5	14.8	0.05	4.2	2.2	
2022 Maximum lbs/day	17.2	14.4	15.4	0.02	0.9	0.7	
City of San Diego Screening Thresholds	137	100	550	250	100	67	
Threshold Exceeded 2021	No	No	No	No	No	No	
Threshold Exceeded 2022	No	No	No	No	No	No	

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

Operational emissions include emissions from electricity consumption (energy sources), vehicle trips (mobile sources), area sources, landscape equipment and evaporative emissions as the structure is repainted over the life of the project. The majority of operational emissions are associated with vehicle trips to and from the project site. Table 2a, *Estimated Operational Emissions – Proposed Project*, summarizes emissions associated with operation of the proposed 63rd and Montezuma project. Table 2b, *Estimated Operational Emissions – Most Intense Use Under Proposed RM-3-9 Zone*, summarizes emissions associated with operation of the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone.

Onevertional Phase	Estimated Emissions (lbs/day)						
Operational Phase	ROG	NOx	CO	SOx	PM 10	PM2.5	
Area	1.1	0.1	3.1	0.01	0.02	0.02	
Energy	0.01	0.07	0.3	0.01	0.01	0.01	
Mobile	0.4	1.7	3.9	0.01	1.5	0.4	
Maximum lbs/day	1.5	1.8	4.9	0.03	1.6	0.4	
SDAPCD Thresholds	137	100	550	250	100	67	
Threshold Exceeded?	No	No	No	No	No	No	

Table 2a Estimated Operational Emissions – Proposed Project

		Estimated Emissions (lbs/day)					
	ROG	NOx	со	SOx	PM 10	PM2.5	
Area	1.2	0.06	2.6	0.01	0.01	0.01	
Energy	0.1	0.06	0.03	0.01	0.01	0.01	
Mobile	1.0	3.9	10.3	0.03	2.9	0.8	
Maximum lbs/day	2.2	4.1	13.0	0.03	2.9	0.8	
SDAPCD Thresholds	137	100	550	250	100	67	
Threshold Exceeded?	No	No	No	No	No	No	

Table 2b Estimated Operational Emissions – Most Intense Use under Proposed RM-3-9 Zone

As shown in Tables 2a and 2b, operational emissions would not exceed the SDAPCD thresholds for ROG, NOx, CO, SOx, PM₁₀ or PM_{2.5}. Therefore, neither the 63rd and Montezuma project operations nor

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
operations of development of the s	ite under the most ir	ntense use that could	d occur with the prop	osed RM-

operations of development of the site under the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone would violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. Impacts would be less than significant.



Refer to III. a). The SDAB is considered a non-attainment under Federal standards for O₃ (8-hour standard). As described above in response III. b), construction operations temporarily increase the emissions of dust and other pollutants. However, construction emissions would be temporary and short-term in duration. As shown in Tables 1a and 1b, construction of the proposed 63rd and Montezuma project or the most intensive use project would not exceed the SDAPCD regional construction emission thresholds for daily emissions. Similarly, as shown in Tables 2a and 2b, operational emissions would not exceed SDAPCD thresholds for ROG, NOX, CO, SOX, PM₁₀, or PM_{2.5}. Thus, neither the 63rd and Montezuma project construction nor development of the site under the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone would result in a cumulatively considerable increase in ozone or particulate matter emissions. Impacts would be less than significant.

d)	Create objectionable odors			
	affecting a substantial number of		\boxtimes	
	people?			

Development of the proposed 63rd and Montezuma project or development of the site under the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone would involve the use of diesel-powered construction equipment. Diesel exhaust may be noticeable temporarily at adjacent properties; however, construction activities would be temporary. Neither the proposed 63rd and Montezuma project nor development of the site under the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone would include industrial or agricultural uses that are typically associated with objectionable odors. Therefore, impacts associated with objectionable odors would be less than significant.

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?

The project site is developed within an urbanized area. No native habitat is located on-site. As such, redevelopment of the project site would not directly, or through habitat modification, affect any species

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

identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) or United States Fish and Wildlife (USFW). Additionally, the project site is not located within or adjacent to the City's Multi-Habitat Preservation Area (MHPA). Therefore, neither the proposed 63rd and Montezuma project nor development of the site under the most intense use that could occur under the proposed RM-3-9 zone would have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species. No impacts would result.

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

Refer to IV. a) above. The site does not contain any riparian habitat. No impacts would result.

Clean Water Act (including but not limited to marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	
--	--

The project site is fully developed and does not contain any Federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. No impacts would result. Also, refer to IV. a) above.

See IV. a) above. The site does not contain any sensitive habitat, migratory fish or wildlife species. No formal and/or informal wildlife corridors are located on or near the project, as the site is located within an urbanized neighborhood. No impacts would result.

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

Refer to IV. a) above. Neither the proposed 63rd and Montezuma project nor development of the site under the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone would conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance. No impacts would result.

ls	sue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?				\boxtimes

Refer to IV. e) above. The project site is located within the Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) San Diego Subarea Plan. However, the project site is not within or adjacent to a Multiple Habitat Planning Area (MHPA). No impacts would result.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

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

Archaeological Resources

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.

According to the archaeology maps in the Environmental Analysis Section library, the site is not located in a high sensitivity area for archaeological resources. The Environmental Analysis Section (EAS) consulted with qualified City staff (QCS) for a California Historic Resources Information System (CHRIS) database search. On May 7, 2020, QCS conducted a CHRIS search and there were no archaeological sites recorded at this location and the site and the surrounding areas have been previously developed. PHS further stated that based on CHRIS search, and background research that no discoveries are anticipated during the construction of the project. QCS determined that no further archaeological evaluation would be required on this project. Impacts to archaeological resources would be less than significant, mitigation would not be required.

Built Environment

A site-specific Historical Resource Research Report (HRRR) were prepared by Brian F. Smith and Associates, Inc., November 13, 2018, and is included as Appendix A. The project proposes the demolition of existing buildings constructed in 1951. SDMC Section 143.0212 requires that all properties 45 years old or older be reviewed for potential historical significance. The City's Plan-Historic staff (PHS), reviewed the site-specific report and determined that the buildings are not eligible for designation under any Historic Resource Board Criteria. Since impacts to significant historic resources were not identified, mitigation would not be required.

The buildings on the project site were not found to be eligible for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) and are not considered historic resources for the purposes of CEQA compliance. Neither the proposed 63rd and Montezuma project nor development of the site under the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of any historical resources. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

	Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?			\boxtimes	
Refe	r to V. a) above.				
c)	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?			\boxtimes	

Fossils (paleontological resources) are the remains and/or traces of prehistoric life and represent an important and nonrenewable natural resource. Impacts to paleontological resources may occur during grading activities associated with project construction where excavation would be done in previously undisturbed geologic deposits/formations/rock units. The project site is underlain by the Lindavista Formation, which is moderately sensitive for paleontological resources. The City's CEQA Significance Determination Thresholds state if grading is greater than 2,000 cubic yards (CY) and 10 feet deep or greater in moderately sensitive formations then a potential impact to paleontological resources could occur. Project Implementation would consist of 50 CY of cut at a maximum depth of cut of 5 feet and 50 (CY) of fill at maximum height of 5 feet. Based on this information the project would not meet the City's CEQA Significance Thresholds for impacts to paleontological resources, monitoring will not be required.

Development that could occur under the most intense use with the proposed RM-3-9 zone is subject to the General Grading Guidelines for Paleontological Resources in the Land Development Manual. Should the most intense use require grading that exceeds the City's thresholds of 2,000 CY and 10 feet deep or greater, compliance with SDMC section 142.0151, Paleontological Resources Requirements for Grading Activities, would require paleontological monitoring, and would ensure potential impacts are less than significant.

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

Refer to V.A. above, additionally no formal cemeteries or human remains are known to exist on-site or in the vicinity. Furthermore, should human remains be discovered during ground-disturbing activities associated with redevelopment of the project site, work would be required to halt in that area and no soil would be exported off-site until a determination could be made regarding the provenance of the human remains via the County Coroner and Native American representative, as required. Both the 63rd and Montezuma project as well as development of the site under the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone would be required to treat human remains uncovered during construction in accordance with the California Public Resources Code (Sec. 5097.98) and State Health and Safety Code (Sec. 7050.5). No impact would occur.

VI. ENERGY - Would the project: a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?

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

During project construction, the California Air Resources Board (CARB) regulates idling for commercial motor vehicles to reduce unnecessary consumption of energy under 13 CCR § 2485, *Airborne Toxic Control Measure to Limit Diesel-Fueled Commercial Motor Vehicle Idling*. Through implementation of this measure, energy consumption during construction would be less than significant.

The proposed residential development would not result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources during operation. Energy usage may incrementally increase once residences are built and occupied; however, energy use would be commensurate with multi-family residential consumption and would not be excessive. The proposed project would be required to meet energy standards of the current California Energy Code (Title 24). In addition, the proposed project would be conditioned to meet building design measures per SDMC that incorporate energy conservation features (window treatments, efficient HVAC systems, etc.). The project would also be required to implement energy-reducing Climate Action Plan (CAP) strategies, such as the use of cool/green roofing materials. Development under the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone would require adherence to City regulations and polices directed at reducing GHG emissions. That, together with meeting the CAP's land use strategy of supporting transit by increasing density in a TPA, would ensure that future development would result in less than significant GHG impacts. See also Section VIII, Greenhouse Gas Emissions. Energy impacts would be minimal and less than significant. No mitigation would be required.

Π

b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?

See Section VIII, Greenhouse Gas Emissions. The City of San Diego's General Plan identifies the site as Residential. The General Plan's residential category allows for various densities of residential development. The project site is currently zoned RM-1-1 (multi-family, allowing one dwelling unit per 3,000 square feet). The proposed rezone would change the existing RM-1-1 zone to RM-3-9 (multi-family, allowing one dwelling unit per 600 square feet) zone. In addition, the project's rooftop deck would support the General Plan Recreation Element's policies encouraging rooftop recreation facilities. The project involves a Community Plan Amendment (CPA) to change the existing land use designation to allow the proposed use. The project site's existing land use designation, as outlined by the College Area Community Plan, is Low/Medium Density Residential (10-15 du/ac) and would change to Residential High (45-73 du/ac) with implementation of the proposed Amendment to the College Area Community Plan. The project site is currently zoned RM-1-1, and the rezone would change the zone to RM-3-9. The project would be consistent with the General Plan and Community Plan with the approval of the rezone and CPA.

Π

 \boxtimes

The project, as well as development under the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone, would require adherence to and appropriately implement the CAP Consistency Checklist. Because neither the project nor development under the most intense use conflict with or obstruct the CAP, no impact would occur.

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS - Would the project:

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

 Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning 			\boxtimes	
--	--	--	-------------	--

Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

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.

A site-specific Preliminary Geotechnical Evaluation was prepared by Accutech Engineering, August 30, 2017, as well as an updated memorandum, January 8, 2020, which is attached as Appendix B and Appendix B1, According to Geology of the San Diego Metropolitan Area, California, the project is assigned geologic risk category 53, which is characterized as level or sloping terrain, unfavorable geologic structure, low to moderate risk. There are no known active faults mapped at or near the project site. The La Nacion fault zone, approximately 1.1 miles to the west of the site, is the closest significant fault and is structurally related to the active Rose Canyon fault zone and is approximately seven miles to the west of the site. The site is not located within a State of California Earthquake Fault Zone (EFZ).

Redevelopment of the project site would be required to comply with seismic requirements of the California Building Code. 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 be less than significant. Pursuant to project conditions of approval, the owner/permittee would be required to submit an updated geological investigation report or update letter to City staff for review and approval prior to project construction. Neither the proposed 63rd and Montezuma project nor development of the site under the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone would result in a rupture of any known earthquake fault. Impacts would be less than significant.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?			
------------------------------------	--	--	--

The site would be affected by seismic shaking as a result of earthquakes on major active faults located throughout the Southern California area. The nearest of active fault system, is the Rose Canyon fault, lies approximately seven miles to the west. 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 be less than significant. Pursuant to project conditions of approval, the owner/permittee would be required to submit an updated geological investigation report or update letter to City staff for review and approval prior to project construction. The multi-family residential development nor development of the site under the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone would result in strong seismic ground shaking. Impacts would be less than significant.



According to the Preliminary Geotechnical Evaluation, no geologic hazards, such as active or potentially active faults, suspected landslides, or areas of potential soil liquefaction, exist at or within the immediate vicinity (within 250 feet of the project site). A potentially active fault (the Mission Bay Segment of the Rose Canyon Fault) exists approximately seven miles to the west of the site.

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact		
Neither the proposed 63 rd and Montezuma project nor development of the site under the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone would result in seismic-related ground failure. No						

impacts would result.

iv) Landslides?		\boxtimes

See VII. a) and VII. iii) above. According to the site-specific geotechnical report, no geologic hazards, such as active or potentially active faults, suspected landslides, or areas of potential soil liquefaction, exist at or within the immediate vicinity, and none were observed during the field evaluation. A review of topographical maps and geologic literature indicates there is no geomorphic or geologic evidence to suggest the presence of ancient deep-seated landsliding on or adjacent to the site. The Landslide Hazards Map for the La Mesa Quadrangle where the project site is located indicates the project site lies within Subarea 3-1, which is defined as containing slopes that are at or near their stability limits due to a combination of weak materials and steep slopes. Such areas typically do not currently contain landslide deposits but can be expected to fail locally when adversely modified. 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 be less than significant. Pursuant to project conditions of approval, the owner/permittee would be required to submit an updated geological investigation report or update letter to City staff for review and approval prior to project construction. Neither the proposed 63rd and Montezuma project nor development of the site under the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone would result in landslides. No impact would result.

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

Construction of the project would temporarily disturb on-site soils during grading activities, thereby increasing the potential for soil erosion to occur. However, the use of standard erosion control measures and implementation of storm water best management practices (BMPs) requirements during construction would preclude impacts. Neither the proposed 63rd and Montezuma project nor development of the site under the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone would result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. 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 offsite landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

Please see VII. a.) Both the proposed 63rd and Montezuma project and development of the site under the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone would be constructed consistent with proper engineering design, in accordance with the California Building Code. Utilization of appropriate engineering design measures and standard construction practices, to be verified at the building permit stage, would ensure that potential impacts from geologic hazards, such as on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse, would be less than significant.

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
 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? 			\boxtimes	

Refer to VII. c). There is no indication that the project site is located on expansive soils. In addition, the proposed 63rd and Montezuma project or the development of the site under the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone would be constructed consistent with proper engineering design, in accordance with the California Building Code. Utilization of appropriate engineering design measures and standard construction practices, to be verified at the building permit stage, would ensure that potential impacts from geologic hazards would not create any substantial risks to life or to the property. Impacts would be 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?

The project site would be served by an existing public sewer system. Neither the proposed 63rd and Montezuma project nor development of the site under the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone would involve the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. No impacts would occur.

VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS – Would the project:

a)	Generate greenhouse gas			
	indirectly, that may have a		\boxtimes	
	significant impact on the			
	environment?			

In December 2015, the San Diego City Council 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) emission reductions. Analysis of GHG emissions and potential climate change impacts from new development is required under CEQA. The CAP is a plan for the reduction of GHG emissions in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15183.5. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15064(h)(3), 15130(d), and 15183(b), a project's incremental contribution to a cumulative GHG emissions effect may be determined not to be cumulatively considerable if it complies with the requirements of the CAP.

The City Council approved the CAP Consistency Checklist in July 2016, and the Checklist was subsequently updated June 2017. 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. The completed CAP Consistency Checklist for the project is located in Appendix C.

Issue

Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

As presented in the project's CAP Consistency Checklist, the project is consistent with Item "B" under Step 1, which applies to projects that are not consistent with the existing land use plan and zoning designations and include a land use plan and/or zoning designation amendment and increases density within a Transit Priority Area (TPA). For consistency with Step 1, Item B, CAP Strategy 3 actions applicable to the project must also be met. The project's CAP Consistency Checklist documents how the project would implement CAP Strategy 3 actions. In summary, the project would result in an increase in the capacity for transitsupportive residential density; contribute to transit priority through decreased parking; provide amenities that support pedestrian activity and access to transit; provide bicycling opportunities consistent with the Bicycle Master Plan; and promotes the use of transit in accordance with the City's regulation regarding Zero Minimum Parking for multi-family residential development within TPAs.

Furthermore, completion of Step 2 of the CAP Consistency Checklist demonstrates the project would be consistent with applicable strategies and actions for reducing GHG emissions. These include project features consistent with the energy and water efficient buildings strategy. These project features would be assured as a condition of project approval. Step 2, Strategy 3: Bicycling, Walking, Transit, and Land Use strategies are not applicable to this project since it is a residential project.

As described in Step 3 of the CAP Consistency Checklist, the project would implement the following:

- General Plan's City of Villages strategy by locating a multi-family residential development within a TPA;
- the General Plan's Mobility Element in a TPA by reducing parking and contributing towards transit priority;
- the City of San Diego's Bicycle Master Plan by providing bicycle support facilities and locating a multi-family development adjacent to a Class II Bike Lane; and
- the Urban Forest Management Plan by providing various tree species on site, contributing to the City's 20 percent urban canopy tree coverage goal.

Because the project is located within a TPA, City Ordinance 21057 regarding zero minimum parking regulations for multi-family developments would apply. In addition, according to SDMC Table 142-05C, no parking is required. Therefore, no electric vehicle parking supply equipment is required. Similarly, Section 142.0530(e)(2)(A) states that long-term bicycle parking spaces are intended for use by employees and shall be required for non-residential development at a rate of five percent of the required automobile parking. Although no automobile parking is required, the project would provide 24 total bicycle parking spaces, in accordance with SDMC Table 142-05C and requirements for bicycle spaces for multiple dwelling unit developments in a TPA.

Unlike the proposed 63rd and Montezuma project, a ministerial project that could occur under the proposed RM-3-9 zone, should the proposed project not proceed, would not be required to complete a CAP Consistency Checklist. However, current City regulations would apply to ministerial projects that would result in reducing GHG emissions. For example, the California Green Building Standards (CALGreen) Code, also referred to as the California Building Standards Code, includes regulations that are enforced by the City of San Diego for projects whose construction permit applications are deemed complete on or after January 1, 2014. The City's Green Building Regulations are included in the Land Development Code (LDC), and address sections related to light pollution reduction for residential and non-residential buildings, water reuse systems for residential buildings, and bicycle and designated parking spaces for non-

residential buildings. The City also adopted the 2013 Building Energy Efficiency Standards for Residential and Nonresidential Buildings. The SDMC requires compliance with the mandatory measures under CalGreen for residential and non-residential projects. Development of the project site under the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone would comply with all mandatory measures under CalGreen, as well as all City regulations outlined in the LDC.

Based on the project's consistency with the City's CAP Consistency Checklist, the project's contribution of GHGs to cumulative statewide emissions would be less than cumulatively considerable. Development under the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone would require adherence to City regulations and polices directed at reducing GHG emissions. That, together with meeting the CAP's land use strategy of supporting transit by increasing density in a TPA, would ensure that future development would result in less than significant GHG impacts. Therefore, the 63rd and Montezuma project's direct and cumulative GHG emissions, either as proposed or under the most intense development scenario, 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 VIII. a), above. No impacts wo	uld result.		
IX. HAZA	ARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Wo	ould the project:		
a)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?		\boxtimes	

The 63rd and Montezuma project would redevelop the project site as a multi-family residential building with associated amenities. The most intense development that could occur on the project site is assumed to be a mixed-use development consisting of multi-family residential units and commercial uses. During project construction, small amounts of solvents and petroleum products could be utilized; although minimal amounts of such substances may be present during construction, they are not anticipated to result in a significant hazard to the public. During the operational phase of the project, the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials is not anticipated. Although small amounts of hazardous materials may be used for cleaning and maintenance, standard best management practices (BMPs) would be applied to ensure that all hazardous materials are handled and disposed of properly and that no hazards would result during the long-term operation of the project. Hazardous materials and waste would be managed and used in accordance with all applicable Federal, State, and local laws and regulations. Therefore, neither the 63rd and Montezuma project nor development of the site under the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone would create a significant hazard to the public or environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. Impacts would be less than significant.

b)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions		\boxtimes
	involving the release of		

Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated

No Impact

 \boxtimes

hazardous materials into the environment?

Refer to IX. a). The proposed project would redevelop the project site as a multi-family residential building with associated amenities. The most intense development that could occur on the project site is assumed to be a mixed-use development consisting of multi-family residential units and commercial uses. During project construction, small amounts of solvents and petroleum products could be utilized; although minimal amounts of such substances may be present during construction, they are not anticipated to result in a significant hazard to the public. During the operational phase of the project, the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials is not anticipated. As such, neither the project nor development of the site under the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone would require the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. Therefore, neither the proposed 63rd and Montezuma project nor development of the site under the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone has the potential to release hazardous materials into the environment. No impacts would result.

c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within onequarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

The closest primary and/or secondary schools to the project site are Harriet Tubman Village Charter School, approximately one mile to the east; and Rolando Elementary, approximately 1.5 miles to the southeast of the project site. San Diego State University (SDSU) classrooms are located approximately 0.5 mile from the project site. Thus, the project site is not within a quarter mile (0.25 mile) of an existing or proposed school. No impact would occur.

d)	Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?		\boxtimes
	environment?		

The project site has not been identified as a hazardous materials site pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. Therefore, neither the proposed 63rd and Montezuma project nor development of the site under the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. No impacts would occur.

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?		
	died?		

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

The basic function of ALUCPs (or Airport Land Use Compatibility Plans) is to promote compatibility between airports and the land uses.

The project site is located approximately eight miles southeast of Montgomery-Gibbs Executive Airport and is within the Airport Influence Area (AIA) Review Area 2, as shown in the Montgomery Field ALUCP maps. Since the project site is within AIA Review Area 2, the 63rd and Montezuma project was not required to submit to the San Diego County Regional Airport Authority, serving as the Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) for a consistency determination. EAS received four FAA Determination of No Hazard letters that the project is not a hazard to air navigation. Development of the project site under the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone would also be required to obtain FAA Determination of No Hazard letter or provide a No FAA Notification Self-Certification Agreement. Therefore, neither the proposed 63rd and Montezuma project nor development of the site under the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone would be expected to result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area. Therefore, no significant impact would result.

f)	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard		\boxtimes
	for people residing or working in the project area?		

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

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

The project, as well as any development that could occur on the project site consistent with the proposed RM-3-9 zone, would occur within an urbanized portion of the community on a site that is already fully developed. No change to the existing circulation network would occur.

In addition, a *Fire Access Plan*, included as Figure 4, was prepared for the project to ensure adequate access points for emergency services. This plan shows the location of all fire hydrants in the immediate area of the project site, aerial ladder access at various points on the building, measurements for minimum hose pull length required to access certain areas on the project site, and the width of the nearest access roads and turn lanes. Like the project, development of the site under the most intense use would require preparation of a Fire Access Plan and review by the City's Fire-Rescue Department and would follow similar guidelines to ensure safe and adequate fire access.

Neither the proposed 63rd and Montezuma project nor development of the site under the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone would impair or physically interfere with the implementation of an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. No impact would result.

 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

	\boxtimes

No Impact

where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

The project site is located within an urbanized developed area. The project site is not adjacent to any wildlands and would not interfere with any wildlands. Neither the proposed multi-family residential development nor development of the site under the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone would expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, or injury, or death involving wildland fires. No impact would result.

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY - Would the project:

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge

A site-specific Storm Water Quality Management Plan and Drainage Plan were prepared by Lundstrom Engineering and Surveying, Inc., August 16, 2018. The Drainage Plan and Storm Water Quality Management Plan (SWQMP) are included as Appendix D and Appendix E. The project is required to comply with all storm water quality standards during and after construction, and Best Management Practices (BMPs) (Site Design, Source Control, and Structural BMPs). Potential impacts to existing water quality standards associated with the multi-family residential development would include minimal shortterm construction-related erosion/ sedimentation and no long-term operational storm water discharge. Conformance to BMPs outlined in the SWQMP and conformance with the City's Storm Water Standards would prevent or effectively minimize short-term water quality impacts. The most intense development that could occur under the proposed RM-3-9 zone would also be required to comply with the City's Storm Water Standards. Therefore, neither the proposed 63rd and Montezuma project nor development of the site under the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone would violate any existing water quality standards or discharge requirements. Impacts would be less than significant.



Neither the proposed 63rd and Montezuma project nor development of the site under the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone would require the construction of wells or the use of groundwater. Furthermore, neither scenario would introduce significant new impervious surfaces that could interfere with groundwater recharge, as the site is already fully developed with predominantly impervious surfaces. Therefore, the project would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge. No impact would result.

c)	Substantially alter the existing			
	drainage pattern of the site or		\boxtimes	
	area, including through the			

Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner, which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or offsite?

See X. a). There are no streams or rivers within the project boundary. Additionally, per the project SWQMP, the project would maintain the current flow patterns on-site. The most intense development that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone would be required to adhere to City requirements regarding drainage and storm water control. Therefore, neither the proposed 63rd and Montezuma project nor development of the site under the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone would substantially alter any existing drainage patterns of the site or area or result in substantial erosion on- or off-site. 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?

As presented in the Drainage Study, there would be no increase in peak flows as a result of the project. Therefore, neither the proposed 63rd and Montezuma project nor development of the site under the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone would significantly alter drainage patterns on the site. Similarly, neither the proposed 63rd and Montezuma project nor development of the site under the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone would substantially increase storm water runoff from the site, nor would either scenario significantly alter the overall drainage scheme for the site or area in a manner that would result in a substantial increase in 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.

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?

Refer to X. a). through X. d) above. The project was reviewed by City staff that determined the project would not exceed the capacity of the existing storm sewer system. On-site low impact design (LID) BMPs and integrated management practices (IMP) would be implemented to control peak runoff from the proposed development. Similar BMPs and IMPs would be implemented for development of the site under the most intense use. Development under the most intense used allowed with the proposed RM-3-9 zone would also be required to comply with City regulations relative to stormwater runoff and control. Adherence with the standards would preclude a cumulatively considerable contribution to water quality. Neither the proposed multi-family residential development nor development of the site under the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone would exceed the capacity of the existing or planned storm water drainage system. Impacts would be less than significant.

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?			\boxtimes	

Refer to X. a) above. Both the project as proposed as well as development of the site under the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone would implement LID and source control and treatment control BMPs as required by the City's Storm Water Standards. Source control BMPs would include on-site storm drain inlets, interior floor drains and elevator shaft sump pumps, indoor and structural pest control, outdoor pesticide use, and fire sprinkler test water. Adherence to the standards would preclude a cumulatively considerable contribution to water quality and would not substantially degrade water quality. Impacts would be less than significant.

g)	Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				
Accord	ing to a Federal Emergency Manager	ment Agency (FEMA)	flood insurance rate	map (FEMA, 2012	2), the
project	site is not located in a 100-year floo	d hazard area. No im	pacts would result.		,,
1 5	, ,		1		
h)	Place within a 100-year flood hazard area, structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?				
Refer to	o X. a) above. No impacts would resu	ılt.			
XI. LAND	USE AND PLANNING – Would the project:				
a)	Physically divide an established community?				\boxtimes

The project involves redevelopment of a previously developed site located in an urban neighborhood. The project would utilize existing right-of-way and roadways. Neither the 63rd and Montezuma project nor development of the site under the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone would physically divide the community. No impact would result.

h)	Conflict with any applicable land			
5)	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 involves a Community Plan Amendment to change the existing land use designation, as well as a Rezone, to allow the proposed use. The project site's existing land use designation, as outlined by the College Area Community Plan, is Low/Medium Density Residential (10-15 du/ac) and would change to Residential High (45-73 du/ac) with implementation of the proposed Amendment to the College Area

Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

Community Plan. The project site is currently zoned RM-1-1, and the rezone would change the zone to RM-3-9. The purpose of the RM zones is to provide for multiple dwelling unit development at varying densities. The RM-3-9 zone specifically is intended to accommodate medium density multiple dwelling units with limited commercial uses and permits a maximum density of one dwelling unit for each 600 square feet of lot area.

The project is located along Montezuma Road and is not within any of subareas specifically identified by the Community Plan. Mostly single-family residential developments occur immediately to the northeast, east, and south; a multi-family residential development bordering the project site to the west, and institutional uses (SDSU) located nearby to the north and northwest.

A Noise Study (Birdseye Planning Group, April 2020) and Noise Study Memorandum (Birdseye Planning Group, December 2020) have been prepared for the project and for the most intense use that could occur on the site with the proposed RM-3-9 zone. The report and memorandum found that the project would be consistent with the exterior noise level standards established by the General Plan Noise Element Table NE-3: Land Use – Noise Compatibility Guidelines, which states that an interior noise standard of 45 decibels, A-weighted (dBA) and an exterior noise level of 60 dBA are compatible for multiple unit residential structures according to the Noise Compatibility Guidelines of the General Plan.

The project-specific Noise Study and Memorandum concluded that neither the proposed project nor the most intense use development would exceed the City's CEQA Significance Thresholds for noise impacts. In addition, the building would be constructed according to California Energy Code Title 24 standards, which specify construction methods and materials that result in up to a 30 dBA reduction in exterior noise levels and would further minimize interior noise levels. Assuming a 30-dBA reduction in noise levels between exterior and interior levels, the 45-dBA interior standard would be met. In addition to the use of construction methods and materials as an attenuation method, noise levels may also be reduced by intervening structures. Generally, a single row of buildings between the receptor and the noise source reduces the noise level by about five dBA, while a solid wall or berm reduces noise levels by five to 10 dBA.

The project site is located outside of 60 dBA CNEL noise contours of Montgomery-Gibbs Executive Airport. The project site is not located in an area that is affected by significant aircraft noise. Redevelopment of the project site would be compatible with the adopted ALUCP for the Montgomery-Gibbs Executive Airport.

The City of San Diego's General Plan identifies the site as Residential. The General Plan's residential category allows for various densities of residential development. The project site is currently zoned RM-1-1 (multi-family, allowing one dwelling unit per 3,000 square feet). The proposed rezone would change the existing RM-1-1 zone to RM-3-9 (multi-family, allowing one dwelling unit per 600 square feet) zone. In addition, the project's rooftop deck would support the General Plan Recreation's Element's policies encouraging rooftop recreation facilities. The project would be consistent with the General Plan with the approval of the rezone.

The project, as well as development of the site as the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone, would support various goals and objectives set forth by the Community Plan. The primary goal of the Community Plan's Housing Element is the preservation of existing single-family neighborhoods. Neither the project nor development of the site as the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone would displace single-family neighborhoods and would occur in an area that does not conflict with existing single-family neighborhoods. Redevelopment of the project site would align with the surrounding area. Both the project and development of the site as the most intense use that could
occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone would also support the housing needs of students of SDSU. The allowed density at SDSU to the west of the site ranges from one dwelling unit per 1,500 square feet (CN-1-2 zone) to one dwelling unit per 400 square feet (RM-4-10 zone). This range of densities is also reflective of the gradual increase in allowed density of land uses west of the project site.

The project proposes a 38-unit multi-family residential building. The most intense development of the project site is assumed to be a mixed-use development consisting of 32 multi-family residential units and 12,657 square feet of commercial uses. Both scenarios would be consistent with the surrounding uses in the College Area Community and would not conflict with any other land use plans, policies, or regulations applicable to the project site. Impacts would be less than significant.

C)	Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?			
Refer	to IV. f) above. No impacts would	result.		
XII. MIN	ERAL 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?			\boxtimes

The project site is located in an urban neighborhood surrounded by existing development. There are no known mineral resources located on the project site. The site is not large enough to allow economically feasible mining operations. Neither the proposed 63rd and Montezuma project nor development of the site under the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone would preclude a mining operation adjacent to or surrounding the site. The site and surrounding properties do not contain any known mineral resources that would be of value to the region. No impact would result.

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

Refer to XII. A) above. The project area has not been delineated on a local General Plan, Community Plan, specific plan, or other land use plan as a locally important mineral resource recovery site, and no such resources would be affected with project implementation. Neither the proposed 63rd and Montezuma project nor development of the site under the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone would result in the loss of availability of a local important mineral resource recovery site. No impact would result.

XIII. NOISE – Would the project result in:

a) Go ex	eneration of, noise levels in xcess of standards established				
-------------	---	--	--	--	--

Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated

No Impact

in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

A Noise Study (April 2020), and Noise Memorandum (December 2020), were prepared by Birdseye Planning Group for the project. The Noise Study and Memorandum are included in Appendix F and Appendix F1.

Construction Noise

Construction of the 63rd and Montezuma project or development of the site as the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone would generate a temporary increase in noise in the project area. The main sources of noise during construction activities would include heavy machinery (such as air compressors, backhoes, tractors, concrete mixers, bulldozers, jack hammers, pavement rollers, street sweepers, man lifts, or dump trucks) used during clearing of the site as well as equipment used for demolition and construction. Average noise levels associated with the use of heavy equipment at construction sites can range from about 81 to 95 dBA at 25 feet from the source, depending on the types of equipment in operation. Noise levels would attenuate to 83 dBA or less at 100 feet or more from the active construction area at all property lines. Construction-related short-term noise levels would be higher than the existing measured ambient noise levels of 65.6 dBA in the project area but would no longer occur once construction is completed. Refer also to XIII (b).

Construction activity would occur during allowable times, in compliance with Section 59.5.0404 of the SDMC. The City of San Diego limits the average sound level from construction noise to 75 decibels at any property zoned residential during the 12-hour period from 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. Noise-sensitive uses near the project site are single- and multi-family residences located to the east, west, and south of the site and along the north side of Montezuma Road. Construction of the project would comply with the City's 75 dBA Leq (12 hour) noise limit. Development of the site as the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone would also be required to comply with this noise limit. Project construction would not result in a significant noise impact. No mitigation measures are required.

Noise levels would attenuate to 85 dBA or less at 50 feet or more from the active construction area. However, the location and intensity of construction activities could vary throughout the day and would typically be limited to an eight-hour workday. Further, the size of the project site limits the number and type of equipment that can work simultaneously in proximity to the adjacent residences. Thus, over the course of a 12-hour day, it is unlikely that the 75-dBA noise standard would be exceeded. Construction activities would be conducted in accordance with the City's Noise Ordinance. Short-term noise impacts associated with construction would not change with either the proposed 63rd and Montezuma project or development of the site under the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone. No impacts would result.

Long Term Operational Noise Exposure

Exterior Traffic Noise

Traffic is the primary noise source that would be generated by the project. Existing measured noise levels are equal to or greater than the residential standard (65 dBA) at the multi-family residences located along Montezuma Road during the peak traffic hour. Whether a traffic-related noise impact would occur is based on whether project traffic, when added to existing traffic, would cause the Leq to exceed the 65 dBA exterior standard.

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

Traffic volumes for peak hour existing and (long-term) project operation were obtained based on trip generation rates for multi-family residences (City of San Diego Trip Generation Manual, May 2003). Morning (AM) peak hour project trips for existing conditions were modeled to determine baseline noise conditions. Project trips were then added to the baseline trips to determine whether the Leg at neighboring receivers would increase by three or more 65 dBA as a result of project-related traffic. The proposed 63rd and Montezuma project is estimated to generate 239 ADT; development under the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone would generate a total of 192 ADT for the residential component and 520 ADT for the commercial component. Noise levels were calculated at the project site (Site 1), Zuma Student Housing west of the site (Site 2), and residences at the southeast corner of Montezuma Road and 63rd Street (Site 3). The existing and projected noise levels with the project and the development of the site as the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone are shown in Table 3a, Modeled Noise Levels with Proposed Project, and Table 3b, Modeled Noise Levels with Most Intense Use, respectively.

······································								
Receptor	Existing Leq	Exceed Standard?	With Project Leq	dBA Change	Significant Impact			
Site 1	64.9	No	65.0	+0.1	No			
Site 2	65.0	No	65.1	+0.1	No			
Site 3	64.9	No	65.0	+0.1	No			

Table 3a. Modeled Noise Levels with Proposed Project

Table 3b, Modeled Noise Levels with Most Intense Use								
Receptor	Existing Leq	Exceed Standard?	With Most Intense Use Leg	dBA Change	Significant Impact			
Site 1	64.9	No	65.4	+0.5	No			
Site 2	65.0	No	65.4	+0.4	No			
Site 3	64.9	No	65.3	+0.4	No			

-...

Noise levels at all receivers were found to be equal to the 65 dBA standard under existing conditions. The proposed project would increase noise levels by 0.1 dBA at the three sites. The development of the site as the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone would increase noise levels by no more than 0.5 dBA. Neither operation of the project nor development of the site as the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone would cause noise levels at representative receivers along Montezuma Road to increase by three dBA or more. Neither the proposed 63rd and Montezuma project nor development of the site under the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone would result in significant adverse traffic noise impacts.

In all cases modeled, the existing interior levels would not noticeably change with the addition of project traffic. Project-related traffic would increase noise levels along Montezuma Road with 0.1 dBA, which is a negligible effect of noise levels.

California Energy Code Title 24 standards specify construction methods and materials that result in energy efficient structures and up to a 30-dBA reduction in exterior noise levels (assuming windows are closed). This includes operation of mechanical ventilation (e.g., heating and air conditioning as discussed below), in combination with standard building construction and design features that include dual-glazed windows with a minimum Sound Transmission Class (STC) rating of 26 or higher. When windows are open, the

Issue

Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

insertion loss drops to about 10 dBA. Assuming windows are closed, interior noise levels at residences along Montezuma Road would be approximately 35 dBA. This would be conditionally compatible with the City of San Diego General Plan Noise Element criteria for single- and multi-family uses, which states that building structures must attenuate exterior noise in occupied areas to 45 dBA CNEL or below. Similarly, the increase in noise levels resulting from development of the site under the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone would not exceed 0.5 dBA. Thus, operational noise impacts would be less than significant.

Another source of exterior use noise would include the HVAC system proposed for the site. HVAC noise levels can be expected to range from 60 to 70 dBA at five feet from the rooftop equipment and ventilation openings. HVAC units would be attenuated by the roof structure, insulation, and crawl space and, thus, would not be audible at even the top floor units of the residential development. Therefore, residences in the proposed building would not be subject to significant HVAC noise. Assuming HVAC units are installed at the center of the rooftop as shown in Figure 5, *Proposed Roof Plan*, or an average of 80 feet from the closest multi-family residential receivers to the south, a 70-dBA reference noise level would attenuate to 52 dBA at 40 feet from the source. HVAC noise would be less than 65 dBA at the any point on the project's property line, based on the distance from the HVAC installation locations to the property lines along the perimeter of the project site. Development of the project site under the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone assumes that HVAC units would be placed in a similar manner as the proposed residential project, (i.e., at the center of each building rooftop). Thus, noise would be attenuated to 52 dBA at 40 feet from the source under the most intense use, resulting in HVAC noise of less than 65 dBA at the property line.

The City's Noise Ordinance and Land Development Code (LDC) regulate noise levels. The proposed project and development that could occur under the RM-3-9 zone would be required to adhere to the City's Noise Regulations.

The project would not result in significant noise levels on adjacent sensitive receptors. Anticipated noise sources associated with operation of the project site include music and residents utilizing the outdoor open space areas (such as the courtyards and roof deck). Nearby sensitive receptors are single- and multifamily residences located to the east, northeast, west and south of the site. As shown on the project plans, effective measures to minimize noise from the project have been incorporated into the project design such as building positioning and direction. For instance, courtyards are located along Montezuma Road and surrounded on three sides by the building. Any noise generated from resident use of courtyards would be facing away from the nearest sensitive receptors. In addition, the rooftop deck would be surrounded by a block wall and glass enclosure, further attenuating noise generated by residents enjoying the rooftop amenity.

The project would not generate noise levels in excess of standards established in the General Plan or the City's Noise Ordinance. Impacts would be less than significant, and mitigation would not be required.



Activities associated with residential use do not generate vibration. However, temporary vibration would occur during construction. While not currently planned for the project, construction activities such as pile

Issue

Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

driving and blasting have the potential to generate ground vibrations near structures. A vibration velocity of 75 VdB is the approximate dividing line between barely perceptible and distinctively perceptible levels. Noise from construction could reach 75 vibration decibels (VdB) at 100 feet from the source, assuming a large bulldozer is used during grading. Thus, while construction activities would be temporary, vibration may be perceptible at adjacent receivers, depending on location and type of equipment.

Ground borne vibration levels in excess of 100 VdB could damage fragile buildings and levels in excess of 95 VdB could damage extremely fragile historical buildings. No historic buildings are located within the project area.

Construction activities that would generate significant vibration levels at or exceeding 95 VdB are not required for the project. For both the proposed 63rd and Montezuma project or development of the site under the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone, construction would occur during daytime hours, which would minimize sleep disturbance. To avoid perceptible vibration occurring at neighboring receivers, small dozers and other construction equipment would be used in proximity to the sensitive receivers north and west of the site during demolition and grading. The project would comply with the City's Noise Ordinance and would not result in the generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels. Development of the site as the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone would also be required to comply with the City's Noise Ordinance. Short-term noise vibration impacts associated with construction would not be significant with either the proposed 63rd and Montezuma project or development of the site under the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone. Furthermore, development of the site under the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone. Furthermore, development of the site under the most intense use would not generate vibration during operational use of the site. Vibration impacts would be less than significant.

C)	A substantial permanent			
	increase in ambient noise levels			
	in the project vicinity above		\boxtimes	
	levels existing without the			
	project?			

Existing ambient noise levels in the project vicinity were found to be 65.6 dBA. Substantial increases in ambient noise levels would not result because the proposed uses on-site are consistent with uses present in the surrounding area. Any ambient noise emanating from the proposed 63rd and Montezuma project or from development of the project site with the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone would be typical of that associated with an urban neighborhood, such as people talking or sound traveling from outdoor areas. Therefore, no substantial increase in ambient noise levels is anticipated. Impacts would be less than significant.

d)	A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above existing without the project?			
Refer t	o XIII. a).			
e)	For a project located within an airport land use plan, or, where		\boxtimes	

No Impact

such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport would the project expose people residing or working in the area to excessive noise levels?

infrastructure)?

Montgomery Field Airport/Gillespie Field is the nearest airport to the project site, located approximately 6.5 miles northeast of the project site. Based on the noise contour maps provided in the Montgomery Field Airport ALUCP, the project site is located outside the 60 dBA noise contours (CNEL) and is not affected by airport noise. As such, the project site is not subject to noise policies of any adopted ALUCP and would not be exposed to excessive aircraft noise or expose people residing or working in the area to excessive noise levels. Impacts would be less than significant.

f)	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				
The pr	roject site is not located within vio	cinity of a privat	e airstrip. No impact v	vould result.	
XIV. POI	PULATION AND HOUSING – Would the pr	oject:			
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				

The project proposes the development of a 38-unit multi-family residential building. The most intense development of the project site is assumed to be a mixed-use development consisting 32 multi-family residential units and 12,657 square feet of commercial uses. Neither scenario involves the extension of roads or services, as the project is an in-fill project located within an existing urban community. The project, as well as development of the site with the most intense use under the proposed RM-3-9 zone, would not induce growth, as neither would open up a new area for development, however the project would provide infill development in an established community. The increased density proposed by the project and what could occur under the most intense use with the proposed RM-3-9 zone would be consistent with multi-family projects in the area and provide housing in proximity to SDSU. The additional housing would reduce vehicle miles travelled to commute from locations farther than the project site to SDSU. Further, any commercial uses that could occur under the RM-3-9 zone would be intended to serve building residents and people living and working in the area.

Therefore, the proposed multi-family development nor development of the site under the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone would induce substantial population growth in the area. No impact would result.

b)	Displace substantial numbers of		
	existing housing, necessitating		

the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

There are three single-family residences that currently exist on the project site. The project proposes to redevelop the site with a 38-unit multi-family residential building. The most intense development of the project site is assumed to be a mixed-use development consisting of 32 multi-family residential units and 12,657 square- feet of commercial uses. Substantial numbers of existing housing would not be displaced by either the multi-family development or development of the site under the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone, and neither would require the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. Impacts would be less than significant.

C)	Displace substantial numbers of			
	people, necessitating the construction of replacement		\boxtimes	
	housing elsewhere?			

There are three currently occupied single-family residences that exist on the project site. The project proposes to redevelop the site with a 38-unit multi-family residential building. The most intense development of the project site is assumed to be a mixed-use development consisting of 32 multi-family residential units and 12,657 square feet of commercial uses. Substantial numbers of people would not be displaced by either the project or development of the site under the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone, and neither would require the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. Impacts would be less than significant.

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES

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

The project site is located in an urbanized area where fire protection services are already provided. San Diego Fire-Rescue Department Station 10 is located about one mile southwest of the project site; La Mesa Fire Department Station 11 is located approximately three miles east of the project site; and Station 31 is located about two miles north of the project site. Neither the proposed multi-family development nor development of the site under the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone would adversely affect existing levels of fire protection services to the area and would not require the construction of new or expanded governmental facilities. Impacts to fire protection would be less than significant.

ii)	Police Protection			\boxtimes	
-----	-------------------	--	--	-------------	--

The project site is located in an urbanized area where police protection services are already provided. The project site would be served by the Mid-City Division of the San Diego Police Department. Neither the proposed multi-family development nor development of the site under the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone would adversely affect existing levels of police protection services to the area and would not require the construction of new or expanded governmental facilities. Impacts to police protection would be less than significant.

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
iii) Schools			\boxtimes	

The project involves the development of a 38-unit multi-family residential building. The most intense development of the project site is assumed to be a mixed-use development consisting of 32 multi-family residential units and 12,657 square feet of commercial uses. Residents could have school-aged children that could attend San Diego Unified School District (SDUSD) schools. For both the 63rd and Montezuma project and development of the site under the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone, the increase in enrollment would not be substantial, and SDUSD has capacity to serve the project. Schools that serve the project site include Clay Elementary School, Hardy Elementary School, Mann Middle School, and Crawford High School.

As such, redevelopment of the project site under the proposed 63rd and Montezuma project and development of the site under the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone, as there are existing educational facilities in the community for school aged children, would not generate or require the construction of new or altered educational facilities. Impacts would be less than significant.



The project involves the development of a 38-unit multi-family residential building. The most intense development of the project site is assumed to be a mixed-use development consisting of 32 multi-family residential units and 12,657 square feet of commercial uses. As presented in the College Area Community Plan, there is a single, one-acre park, Montezuma Park, located within the boundaries of the community. Montezuma Park is located approximately 0.5-mile southeast of the project site.

Both the project as well as development of the site under the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone would increase the use of existing parks, as the project would generate new population. Pursuant to project conditions of approval, prior to the issuance of the first residential building permit, the Owner/Permittee shall pay a park in-lieu fee, of \$147,961.00 to be deposited into the Developer Contributions – CIP Fund, Fund No. 200636, for park and recreation facilities in the College Area community. The park portion of the current per-unit DIF to be paid at the time of building permit issuance, provides for public facilities required to support the proposed population. Impacts would be less than significant.

	vi)	Other public facilities				\boxtimes
The pr multi-f the pro requir would	ojec ami opos e the occu	t site is located in an urbar ly development nor develo sed RM-3-9 zone would not e construction of new or ex ur.	nized area where C pment of the site i adversely affect e panded governme	Tity services are alread under the most intens existing levels of faciliti ental facilities. No imp	ly provided. The pl e use that could o les to the area anc acts to other publi	roposed ccur with l would not c facilities
XVI. REC	REAT	ION				
a)	Wo use anc rect sub	uld the project increase the of existing neighborhood l regional parks or other reational facilities such that istantial physical				

deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

Both the multi-family development as well as development of the site under the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone could increase the use of existing parks or recreational facilities, as the project would generate new population. However, the increase in use would not result in substantial physical deterioration of existing community recreational facilities or the need for construction of new facilities. In addition, pursuant to project conditions of approval, prior to the issuance of the first residential building permit, the Owner/Permittee shall pay a park in-lieu fee, of \$147,961 to be deposited into the Developer Contributions – CIP Fund, Fund No. 200636, for park and recreation facilities in the College Area community. The park portion of the current per-unit DIF to be paid at the time of building permit issuance, provides for public facilities required to support the proposed population. Impacts would be less than significant.

 \square

 \square

 \boxtimes

 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?

The project involves the development of a 38-unit multi-family residential building. On-site recreational amenities include courtyards and a rooftop deck and a patio. The impacts of constructing those facilities are included with the overall construction of the project. The most intense development of the project site is assumed to be a mixed-use development consisting of 32 multi-family residential units and 12,657 square feet of commercial uses. On-site recreational facilities could occur as part of the most intense use and would be in accordance with requirements of the RM-3-9 zone. Neither the proposed 63rd and Montezuma project nor development of the site under the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone would require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. No impacts would result.

XVII. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC - Would the project?

Conflict with an applicable plan, a) ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass \boxtimes 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?

Neither the project nor development of the site that could occur under the most intense use with the proposed RM-3-9 zone would result in conflicts with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system. The City's CEQA Significance Determination Thresholds establish vehicle miles traveled (VMT) as the metric to measure transportation environmental impacts in conformance with Senate Bill 743 (SB 743). The City's Transportation Study

Manual (TSM) provides the following screening criteria to determine if a project requires preparation of a detailed transportation VMT analysis. A project that meets at least one of the following screening criteria is presumed to have a less than significant VMT impacts due to the project's characteristics and/or location:

- 1. **Residential or Commercial Project Located in a VMT Efficient Area** (defined as 15% or more below the base year average household VMT/capita or VMT/employee based on the applicable location-based screening map produced by SANDAG).
- 2. Industrial Project Located in a VMT Efficient Area.
- 3. **Small Project** (defined as generating less than 300 daily unadjusted driveway trips using the City of San Diego trip generation rates/procedures).
- 4. **Locally Serving Retail/Recreational Project** (defined as having 100,000 square feet gross floor area or less and demonstrates through a market area study that the market capture area for the project is approximately three miles or less and serves a population of roughly 25,000 people or less).
- 5. **Locally Serving Public Facility** (defined as a public facility that serves the surrounding community or a public facility that is a passive use).
- 6. **Affordable Housing** (defined as having access to transit and wholly or has a portion that meets one of the following criteria: is affordable to persons with a household income equal to or less than 50% of the area median income (as defined by California Health and Safety Code Section 50093), housing for senior citizens as defined in Section 143.0720(e), housing for transitional foster youth, disabled veterans, or homeless persons as defined in 143.0720(f)).
- 7. **Mixed Use Project Screening Considerations**: The project's individual land uses should be compared to the screening criteria above. For purposes of applying the small project screening criteria, the applicant would only include the trip generation for portions of the project that are not screened out based on other screening criteria.
- 8. **Redevelopment Project Screening Considerations**: The project is a redevelopment project that demonstrates that the proposed project's total project VMT is less than the existing land use's total VMT.

The 63rd and Montezuma project would meet at least two of the screening criteria. The project is located in a **VMT efficient area**. According the SANDAG San Diego Region SB 743 VMT Maps (Series 14, 2016), the project site is located in an area that is 80.9 percent of the regional VMT/capita the regional mean. The project would be expected to generate approximately 228 daily trips and, therefore, meets the criterion for a **small project**. Because the project would meet at least one of the screening criteria, the project is presumed to result in a less than significant VMT impact.

If the project site were to redevelop based on the most intensive use allowed in the proposed RM-3-9 zone, the retail portion of that development would meet one of the screening criteria by providing **locally serving retail** uses. The local-serving uses could include food beverage, and groceries, convenience sales, and personal services that would serve the SDSU student population and near-by single family neighborhoods; eating and drinking establishments are not permitted in the RM-3-9 zone. The residential portion of the most intensive use development scenario would result in fewer residential units than the proposed 63rd and Montezuma project. Thus, the most intense use project would also result in a less than significant VMT impacts, neither the project nor development of the site that could occur under the most intense use with the proposed RM-3-9 zone would result in significant impacts with regards to intersections, streets, highways, and freeways.

Regarding pedestrian and bicycle access, contiguous sidewalks and Class II bike lanes currently exist on both sides of Montezuma Road in the project area. The project would construct a non-contiguous sidewalk along the majority of the Montezuma Road frontage. MTS Bus Route 14 provides service along Montezuma Road at a weekday frequency of one stop per hour. A bus stop is located at the project site, just west of 63^{rd} Street; the bus stop would be retained with project development and upgraded with a bus shelter, landscaping, and additional signage identifying transit routes and general transit information.

Neither the project nor development of the site as the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone would conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system. 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 XVII. a). Neither the proposed 63rd and Montezuma project nor development of the site under the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone would adversely affect any mode of transportation in the area. Therefore, neither the project nor development of the site under the most intense use would conflict with any applicable congestion management program, level of service standards, or travel demand measures. Impacts are considered less than significant.

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

Implementation of either the proposed 63rd and Montezuma project or development of the site under the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone would not result in a change in air traffic patterns, as the project would not be constructed at a height that would impair air travel. The project site is outside all safety zones of nearby airports. The FAA reviewed the project and determined the project would not be a hazard to Air Navigation. Therefore, no significant impact would result. Development of the project site that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone would be required to obtain a FAA Determination of No Hazard letter or provide a No FAA Notification Self-Certification Agreement. Neither the 63rd and Montezuma project nor development of the site as the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone would result in a substantial safety risk. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Access points, such as driveways ar	nd building entryway	s, to the project site	have been designed	consistent

with the City's engineering standards, and would not create a hazard for motorcycles, bicycles, or pedestrians entering or exiting the site. Visibility triangles are portions of both public and private property at any corner bounded by the curb line or edge of a roadway of the intersecting streets, and a line joining points on a curb or edge of the roadway 15 feet from the point of intersection of the extended curb lines or roadway edges. The building envelope has been designed to accommodate appropriate visibility triangles at the northwest and southwest corners of the project site and would not create a hazardous condition at these points. Neither the proposed 63rd and Montezuma project nor development of the site under the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone would include any design features or incompatible uses that could create a hazard to the public. No significant impacts would result.

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

Project design is subject to City review and approval for consistency with all design requirements for emergency access. A Fire Access Plan was prepared for the project to ensure adequate access points for emergency services. This plan shows the location of all fire hydrants in the immediate area of the project site, aerial ladder access at various points on the building, measurements for minimum hose pull length required to access certain areas on the project site, and the width of the nearest access roads and turn lanes. Similar to the multi-family residential project, development of the site under the most intense use would require review by the City's Fire-Rescue Department and would follow similar guidelines to ensure safe and adequate fire access. Both the proposed 63rd and Montezuma project and development of the site under the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone were reviewed and approved by the City's Fire Plan staff. 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?

Regarding public transit, MTS Bus Route 14 provides service along Montezuma Road, with a bus stop located at the project site, just west of 63rd Street; the bus stop would be retained with project development as the project would add a bus shelter, landscaping, and additional signage identifying transit routes and general transit information to the existing bus stop. The nearest trolley station is the SDSU Transit Center, located approximately 0.4-mile to the northwest of the project site.

 \square

 \boxtimes

Regarding bicycle facilities, Class II bike lanes currently exist on both sides of Montezuma Road in the project area. In accordance with City regulations, the project would provide 24 bicycle parking spaces onsite to facilitate and encourage bicycle use as a mode of transportation. Development of the site as the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone would also be required to provide bicycle facilities in accordance with City regulations.

Regarding pedestrian access, contiguous sidewalks currently exist on both sides of Montezuma Road in the project area. The project would construct a non-contiguous sidewalk along the majority of the Montezuma Road frontage. Additionally, the project includes accessible travel routes on-site and that connect to Montezuma Road, thereby enhancing pedestrian connectivity. Development of the site under the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone would be required to adhere to City

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

regulations regarding pedestrian accessibility and frontage improvements to enhance the pedestrian experience.

As such, the 63rd and Montezuma project, as well as development of the site as the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone, would support active transportation and the active transportation network and would not conflict with any adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities. No impact would result.

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

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

Refer to V(a). Neither the multi-family residential development nor development of the site under the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone would 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 Section 5020.1(k). No impact would result.

 \boxtimes

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.		

Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52) requires as part of CEQA, evaluation of tribal cultural resources, notification of tribes, and opportunity for tribes to request a consultation regarding impacts to tribal cultural resources when a project is determined to require a Negative Declaration, Mitigated Negative Declaration or Environmental Impact Report under CEQA. In compliance with AB-52, the City notified all tribes that have previously requested such notification for projects within the City of San Diego.

In accordance with the requirements of Assembly Bill (AB) 52, the City of San Diego initiated AB 52 Notification on May 7, 2020, to lipay Nation of Santa Ysabel, and Jamul Indian Village, and on January 5, 2021, AB 52 Notification was sent to San Pasqual Band of Mission Indians via email correspondence. EAS received email correspondence by Tribal Representatives that they had no further concerns for potential

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

impacts to Tribal Cultural Resources, and consultation was closed on this project. No impacts would occur to Tribal Cultural Resources.

XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:

a)	Exceed wastewater treatment	_	_	_	
	Regional Water Quality Control			\boxtimes	
	Board?				

Adequate municipal sewer services are available to serve the project. Wastewater would not be treated onsite. Neither the proposed multi-family development nor development of the site under the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone would exceed wastewater treatment requirements. Impacts would be less than significant.

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?		
Refer t	o XIX.a., above.		
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?		

Refer to X. e) above. According to the site-specific Drainage Study, neither the proposed 63rd and Montezuma project nor development of the site under the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone would exceed the capacity of the City's existing storm water drainage system and would not require the expansion of the system. The existing public storm drain outfalls to Alvarado Creek, which then joins with the San Diego River and Pacific Ocean. Development of the project would result in runoff outfalls to Montezuma Road, and would travel 500 feet west along street gutter into an existing public curb inlet and storm drain. No adverse impacts would occur downstream to public drainage facilities, and there would be no increase in runoff from the proposed grading plan for the project. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

According to the CEQA Significance Determination Thresholds, a Water Supply Assessment (WSA) was not required for the 63rd and Montezuma project. Development of the project site with the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone would not result in the construction of 500 or more residential units or development in excess of 500,000 square feet of commercial retail space and,

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

therefore, would also not require preparation of a WSA. Adequate water entitlements and resources are available to serve the residential project, as well as development of the site as the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone. Neither the proposed 63rd and Montezuma project nor development of the site under the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone would require the expansion of water supply 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?

Refer to XIX. a) above. The project, as well as development of the project site with the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone, were reviewed by Public Utilities staff, who determined that adequate services are available to serve the site. Impacts would be less than significant.

 \boxtimes

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

The City of San Diego has established a threshold stating that projects that include the construction, demolition, and/or renovation of 40,000 square-feet or more of building space may generate approximately 60 tons of waste or more and are considered to have cumulative impacts on solid waste facilities. The multi-family development exceeds this threshold and prepared a Waste Management Plan (WMP) to identify measures that would be implemented to reduce potential solid waste impacts such that significant impacts are avoided. A Waste Management Plan was prepared by KLR Planning (July 2020), and is included in Appendix G. The WMP identified measures (such as including landscaping to reduce yard waste, utilizing sustainable design features and complying with the voluntary measures in the California Green Building Standards Code relative to cool/green roofs, or targeting 20 percent of solid waste to be recycled) that would be implemented to reduce potential solid waste impacts such that significant impacts are avoided.

Debris and waste generated by demolition and construction for the proposed 63rd and Montezuma project, as well as with the development of the site as the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone, would be managed under the City's Construction and Demolition (C&D) Debris Diversion Deposit Program. This ordinance requires that the applicant post a deposit, which is not returned until the applicant demonstrates that a specified amount of the material generated by the work has been diverted from disposal in landfills. Both the proposed 63rd and Montezuma project and development of the site under the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone would be required to adhere to the City's waste generation reduction requirements. All solid waste from the project site would be transported through contract with a private hauler to an appropriate facility, which would have adequate capacity to accept the waste generated by the project. The commercial facilities on the project would be required to comply with the requirements of the City's Recycling Ordinance (SDMC Section 66.0701 et. seq), applicable to recycling by commercial facilities. Impacts would be less than significant.

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulation related to solid waste?			\boxtimes	

Refer to XIX. f) above. In 1989, the California Legislature passed Assembly Bill (AB) 939: Integrated Waste Management Act, which mandated that all cities reduce waste disposed in landfills from generators within their borders by 50 percent by the year 2000. AB 939 required all local governments to prepare a Source Reduction and Recycling Element, which incorporates waste management policies and programs to achieve the mandated waste reduction. Since 1990, the City has diverted more than 50 percent of its generated waste stream from disposal. This bill specified that solid waste should be considered by the equation <u>GENERATED = DISPOSED + DIVERTED</u>. "Diverted" materials are put into a *hierarchy* in the law, as follows:

- First *source reduction*, such as using a reusable bag, making double-sided copies, or other measure that stops waste at the source.
- Secondary measures include *recycling* and *composting*. Because these measures often have transportation and processing impacts, they are considered less preferable than source reduction.
- In the Public Resources Code, various methods of *transformation* for energy production are limited to ten percent of the total waste reduction target.

In 2008, Senate Bill (SB)1016 was chaptered. Known as the Solid Waste Disposal Measurement Act, SB 1016 maintained the 50 percent diversion requirement, but changed to a disposal-based measurement system, expressed as the 50 percent Equivalent Per Capita Disposal Target. This built upon AB 939 by implementing a simplified and timelier indicator of jurisdiction performance that focuses on reported disposal at Board-permitted disposal facilities. This established a goal not of recycling more, but disposing of less. AB 341: Jobs and Recycling, chaptered in 2011, was intended to create green jobs by expanding recycling to every multi-family dwelling and business. It charged CalRecycle with responsibility for ensuring that the State is diverting at least 75 percent of solid waste that is generated within the State by 2020. SB 1016 establishes that compliance with State law is measured by reducing the amount of waste material requiring disposal, and AB 341 increases the diversion target to 75 percent.

Additional local regulation pertaining to solid waste management includes the City of San Diego's Municipal Code Ch.14 Art. 2 Div. 8: §142.0810, §142.0820, Ch. 6 Art. 6 Div. 7; §66.0706, §66.0709, §66.0710; and Ch. 6 Art. 6 Div. 6; §66.0711, §66.0604, §66.0606. These statues designate refuse and recycling space allocation requirements for:

- on-site refuse and recyclable material storage requirements,
- diversion of construction and demolition debris regulations, and
- diversion of recyclable materials generated from residential facilities, businesses, commercial/institutional facilities, apartments, condominiums, and special events requiring a City permit.

The City Recycling Ordinance is found in Municipal Code section 66.0701 et. seq. It requires the provision of recycling service for all single-family residences; and commercial facilities and multi-family residences with service for four cubic yards or more. In addition, the ordinance also requires development of educational materials to ensure occupants are informed about the City's ordinance and recycling services including information on types of recyclable materials accepted.

Issue

Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

Construction and Demolition (C&D) Debris Diversion Deposit Program applies to all applicants for building, demolition, and removal permits. This ordinance requires that the applicant post a deposit that is not returned until the applicant demonstrates that a minimum amount of the material generated has been diverted from disposal in landfills. Mixed construction debris recycling facilities in San Diego are evaluated quarterly to determine how much of the production material is recycled, and how much is a "residual" material requiring disposal. Facilities that accept mixed debris typically achieve a 68 percent or less diversion rate. Single materials recyclers, such as metal recyclers, often achieve a nearly 100 percent diversion rate. When comingled materials are sent to a mixed facility, the 75 percent diversion goal established by AB 341 will not be met. Depending on the project, to ensure that the overall diversion rates, such as aggregate and metal recyclers.

Demolition, grading, and construction for the project would occur over a period of 14 months. The demolition phase would generate approximately 2,757.18 tons of waste. Approximately 2,644.19 tons, or approximately 96 percent, of waste generated by demolition would be recycled. Implementation of the multi-family development, the project proposes 50 cy of cut and 50 cy of fill. As concluded in the Waste Management Plan, the project proposes to divert approximately 156 tons, or 88 percent, of the construction waste generated by the project. Additionally, the project would implement a target of 20 percent recyclable material.

During occupancy, the expected generated waste per year from the project when fully occupied would be approximately 45.6 tons. On-site recycling services shall be provided to all tenants and residents within the project. Landscape maintenance would include the collection of green waste and recycling of green waste at recycling centers that accept green waste. This would help further reduce the waste generated by developments within the project during occupancy.

Unlike the proposed 63rd and Montezuma project, a ministerial project would not be required to complete a WMP. However, development of the project site under the most intense use that could occur under the proposed RM-3-9 zone would also be required to adhere to City regulations and programs relative to construction and demolition, diversion, recycling, and reuse. These ordinances and programs are directed at minimizing solid waste from individual projects such that significant impacts would not occur. As such, both the proposed 63rd and Montezuma project and development of the site under the most intense use allowed under the proposed RM-3-9 zone would comply with Federal, State, and local statutes relative to solid waste. Impacts would be less than significant.

XX. WILDFIRE – Would the project:

a)	Substantially impair an adopted			
	emergency response plan or emergency		\boxtimes	
	evacuation plan?			

The 2017 San Diego County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan (SDHMP) is the San Diego region's plan toward greater disaster resilience in accordance with section 322 of the Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000. The project would not conflict with the goals, objectives, and actions of the SDHMP. The project site is in a previously developed area, with existing public service infrastructure serving the site. In addition, the project was reviewed by the City Fire Department, and the project meets fire access requirements. No negative impact to ingress and egress on adjacent streets would result. Therefore, neither the proposed 63rd and Montezuma project nor development of the site under the most intense use allowed under the

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

proposed RM-3-9 zone would substantially impair an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan. Impacts would be less than significant.

b)	Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, polytext concentrations from a wildfire		\boxtimes	
	pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of wildfire?			

The project is located in a Very High Fire Severity Zone. However, the project site is in a developed urban neighborhood surrounded by existing development and would not be subject to brush management regulations. In addition, the multi-family development project and its Fire Access Plan have been reviewed and accepted by the City staff. Neither the proposed 63rd and Montezuma project nor development of the site under the most intense use allowed under the proposed RM-3-9 zone would expose project occupants, to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of wildfire. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

c)	Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing		
	impacts to the environment?		

See XX a) and b). The site is in an urban residential neighborhood with existing infrastructure that would serve the project after construction. No new construction of roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines, or other utilities would be required that would exacerbate fire risk. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

d)	Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a		\boxtimes	
	result of runoff, post-fire slope			
	instability, or drainage changes?			

See XX a). The project site is relatively flat and slopes to the north at a three percent grade. Most of the project area is within developed land with limited amount of vegetated land cover. Landscaped areas are non-native and consist of permanently irrigated vegetation. The proposed facilities intended to manage runoff from the site include appropriate grading of pads to direct runoff away from structures on the site, as well as a private storm drain system. The project would not expose people or structures to significant risk from flooding or landslide as a result of runoff, post-fire instability, or drainage changes. Impacts would be less than significant.

 \boxtimes

XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE -

 a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below

53

 \boxtimes

No Impact

self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

Both the 63rd and Montezuma project and development of the site as the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone would redevelop a previously developed site. The project site does not contain biological or historical resources, and redevelopment would not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. Neither the proposed 63rd and Montezuma project nor development of the site under the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone would have the potential to result in significant impacts to paleontological or historical resources. Impacts would be less than significant.

b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are
considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable futures projects)?

Neither the proposed 63rd and Montezuma project nor development of the site under the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone has the potential to result in cumulatively considerable environmental effects. Neither the proposed 63rd and Montezuma project nor development of the site as the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone would have any impacts on biological or cultural resources. The project, as well as the most intense use, would be consistent with the SIP, AQMP, and RAQS, and would not contribute air emissions that have the potential to degrade local air quality. Neither the proposed 63rd and Montezuma project nor development of the site under the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone would have the potential to result in noise impacts. Therefore, neither the proposed 63rd and Montezuma project nor development of the site under the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone would have the potential to result in noise impacts. Therefore, neither the proposed 63rd and Montezuma project nor development of the site under the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone would have any impacts, even taking past, current, and future projects into consideration. Impacts would be less than significant.

C)	Does the project have			
	environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects		\boxtimes	
	on human beings, either directly	_		
	or indirectly?			

Issue Potentially Significat Impact	Less Than Significant Less Than S with Mitigation Impa Incorporated	gnificant No Impact ct
--	---	---------------------------

Construction and operation of the either the project as proposed or development of the site under the most intense use that could occur with the proposed RM-3-9 zone would not cause environmental effects that would significantly directly or indirectly impact human beings. Impacts would be less than significant.

INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST REFERENCES

I. Aesthetics / Neighborhood Character

- <u>X</u> City of San Diego General Plan.
- X Community Plans: College Area Community Plan, 1989

II. Agricultural Resources & Forest Resources

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

III. Air Quality

- _____ California Clean Air Act Guidelines (Indirect Source Control Programs) 1990
- X Regional Air Quality Strategies (RAQS) APCD
- <u>X</u> Site Specific Report: Air Emission Memorandum for the 63rd and Montezuma Student Housing Project, prepared by: Birdseye Planning Group, January 5, 2021.

IV. Biology

- X City of San Diego, Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP), Subarea Plan, 1997
- <u>X</u> City of San Diego, MSCP, "Vegetation Communities with Sensitive Species and Vernal Pools" Maps, 1996
- X City of San Diego, MSCP, "Multiple Habitat Planning Area" maps, 1997
- _____ Community Plan Resource Element
- California Department of Fish and Game, California Natural Diversity Database, "State and Federally-listed Endangered, Threatened, and Rare Plants of California," January 2001
 California Department of Fish & Game, California Natural Diversity Database, "State and
- Federally-listed Endangered and Threatened Animals of California, "January 2001
- ____ City of San Diego Land Development Code Biology Guidelines
- _____ Site Specific Report:

V. Cultural Resources (includes Historical Resources)

- X City of San Diego Historical Resources Guidelines
- _____ City of San Diego Archaeology Library
- _____ Historical Resources Board List
- ____ Community Historical Survey:
- X Site Specific Report: Historical Resource Research Report for the 6253-6275 Montezuma Road Buildings, prepared by: Brian F. Smith and Associates, Inc., November 13, 2018.

VI. Energy

- X City of San Diego Climate Action Plan (CAP), (City of San Diego 2020)
- X City of San Diego Climate Action Plan Consistency Checklist, September 9, 2020

VI. Geology/Soils

X City of San Diego Seismic Safety Study

- <u>X</u> U.S. Department of Agriculture Soil Survey San Diego Area, California, Part I and II, December 1973 and Part III, 1975
- <u>X</u> Site Specific Report: Preliminary Geotechnical Evaluation for a Proposed Multi-Unit Apartment Building to Replace the Existing Structures Located at 6253-6265-6275 Montezuma Road, prepared by: Accutech Engineering, August 30, 2017.
- <u>X</u> Site Specific Memorandum: Reply to Plan Check Cycle 6, LDR Geology dated 7/29/2019 Re: Preliminary Geotechnical Evaluation for a Proposed Multi-Unit Apartment Building to Replace the Existing Structures Located at 6253-6265-6275 Montezuma Road, prepared by: Accutech Engineering, January 8, 2020.
- <u>X</u> Geology of the San Diego 30 X 60 minute Quadrangle, San Diego, California., California Geologic Survey Regional Geologic Map Series, 1:100,000 Scale; Map, No. 3, Sheet 1. Kennedy, M. P., and Tan, S.S., 2008,

VII. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

X Site Specific Report: <u>Climate Action Plan Consistency Checklist, September 9, 2020</u>

VIII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

- X San Diego County Hazardous Materials Environmental Assessment Listing, Geotracker
- X Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan
- _____ Site Specific Report:

IX. Hydrology/Water Quality

- _____ Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM)
- <u>X</u> Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), National Flood Insurance Program-Flood Boundary and Floodway Map
- Clean Water Act Section 303(b) list, <u>http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/tmdl/303d_lists.html</u>
- <u>X</u> Site Specific Report: <u>Drainage Study for 63rd & Montezuma, prepared by Lundstrom</u> <u>Engineering and Surveying, Inc., October 16, 2018.</u>
- X Site Specific Report: <u>Storm Water Quality Management Plan (SWQMP) 63rd & Montezuma,</u> prepared by Lundstrom Engineering and Surveying, Inc., July 27, 2020.

X. Land Use and Planning

- X City of San Diego General Plan
- X Community Plan
- X Gillespie Field Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan
- X Montgomery Field Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan
- <u>X</u> City of San Diego Zoning Maps
- _____ Other Plans:

XI. Mineral Resources

- <u>X</u> California Department of Conservation Division of Mines and Geology, Mineral Land Classification
- <u>X</u> Division of Mines and Geology, Special Report 153 Significant Resources Maps Site Specific Report:

XII. Noise

X City of San Diego General Plan

- ____ Community Plan
- _____ San Diego International Airport Lindbergh Field CNEL Maps
- Brown Field Airport Master Plan CNEL Maps
- X Montgomery Field CNEL Maps
- ____ San Diego Association of Governments San Diego Regional Average Weekday Traffic Volumes
 - ____ San Diego Metropolitan Area Average Weekday Traffic Volume Maps, SANDAG
- <u>X</u> Site Specific Report: 63rd and Montezuma Student Housing Project Noise Study, prepared by Birdseye Planning Group, April 2020
- <u>X</u> Site Specific Report: Noise Memorandum for the 63rd and Montezuma Student Housing Project, San Diego, California, prepared by Birdseye Planning Group, December 31, 2020

XIII. Paleontological Resources

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

XIV. Population / Housing

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

XV. Public Services

- X City of San Diego General Plan
- <u>X</u> Community Plan

XVI. Recreational Resources

- X City of San Diego General Plan
- X Community Plan, 1988
- _____ Department of Park and Recreation
- ____ City of San Diego San Diego Regional Bicycling Map
- _____ Additional Resources:

XVII. Transportation / Circulation

- X City of San Diego General Plan
- <u>X</u> City of San Diego Transportation Study Manual, September 29, 2020.
- <u>X</u> College Area Community Plan, 1989.

- ____ San Diego Metropolitan Area Average Weekday Traffic Volume Maps, SANDAG
- _____ San Diego Region Weekday Traffic Volumes, SANDAG

XVIII. Utilities

<u>X</u> Site Specific Report: <u>Waste Management Plan for 63rd and Montezuma Project, prepared by KLR Planning, July 2020.</u>

XIX. Water Conservation

_____ Sunset Magazine, New Western Garden Book, Rev. ed. Menlo Park, CA: Sunset Magazine

XXII. Wildfire

- <u>X</u> City of San Diego General Plan
- X Community Plan: College Area
- <u>X</u> Very High Fire Severity Zone Map, City of San Diego
- X City of San Diego Brush Management Regulations, Landscape Regulations (SDMC 142.0412)





Vicinity Map <u>63rd and Montezuma PDP/RZ/CPA/ Project No.</u> <u>623199</u> City of San Diego – Development Services Department





Project Location Map 63rd and Montezuma PDP/RZ/CPA/ Project No. 623199 City of San Diego – Development Services Department





Site Plan 63rd and Montezuma / Project No. 623199 City of San Diego – Development Services Department

FIGURE No. 3

KEY NOTES

- 1 RESIDENTIAL ENTRANCE
- 2 TRASH ACCESS
- 3 COURTYARD
- 4 LANDSCAPING (SEE LANDSCAPE PLANS)
- 5 EASEMENT
- 6 TRANSFORMER
- 7 FENCE/GATE

- PENCE/GATE
 SUSBILITY TRIANGLE
 BUS PAD
 COVERED BUS STOP

NOTES

LEGEND

 \square

- PROPERTY LINE
 - SETBACK LINE LINE

STREET CIRCULATION

ACCESSIBLE PATH OF TRAVEL FIRE HYDRANT





Fire Access Plan <u>63rd and Montezuma / Project No. 623199</u> City of San Diego – Development Services Department





Proposed Roof Plan 63rd and Montezuma / Project No. 623199 City of San Diego – Development Services Department





(1) NORTH ELEVATION



(2) EAST ELEVATION



Building Elevations – North and East 63rd and Montezuma / Project No. 623199 City of San Diego – Development Services Department







(1) SOUTH ELEVATION



(2) WEST ELEVATION



Building Elevations – South and West <u>63rd and Montezuma / Project No. 623199</u> City of San Diego – Development Services Department









Vicinity Map <u>63rd and Montezuma PDP/RZ/CPA/ Project No.</u> <u>623199</u> City of San Diego – Development Services Department





Project Location Map 63rd and Montezuma PDP/RZ/CPA/ Project No. 623199 City of San Diego – Development Services Department

FIGURE No. 2

61





Site Plan <u>63rd and Montezuma / Project No. 623199</u> City of San Diego – Development Services Department





Fire Access Plan <u>63rd and Montezuma / Project No. 623199</u> City of San Diego – Development Services Department




Proposed Roof Plan <u>63rd and Montezuma / Project No. 623199</u> City of San Diego – Development Services Department

FIGURE No. 5





<u>NORTH ELEVATION</u>



(2) EAST ELEVATION



Building Elevations – North and East 63rd and Montezuma / Project No. 623199 City of San Diego – Development Services Department

FIGURE No. 6

Ş	
5	
10-0	
10-0	5
10-0	
10-0	





(1) SOUTH ELEVATION

,

.



(2) WEST ELEVATION



Building Elevations – South and West 63rd and Montezuma / Project No. 623199 City of San Diego - Development Services Department FIGURE No. 7