



Land Development
Review Division
(619) 446-5460

Mitigated Negative Declaration

Project No. 6839

SUBJECT: Sharp Hospital: CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT (CUP No. 11504), PLANNED DEVELOPMENT PERMIT (PDP No. 11505), and amendment to CUP No. 88-1297 and 41-0408 to construct a seven-story, 117-foot-tall, 315,621-square-foot hospital building and demolish five floors of an existing nine-story hospital building (North Tower). The project would demolish 272 parking spaces on-site to allow for the construction of the proposed hospital building, and construct 47 new parking spaces on-site. The site is located on a four-acre site at 7901 Frost Street, in the Serra Mesa Community Plan area (Parcel 1 of Parcel Map 5131). Applicant: Sharp Healthcare.

Update: Minor revisions to this document have been made when compared to the draft Mitigated Negative Declaration. The changes do not affect the environmental analysis or conclusion of this document. All revisions are shown in a strike/underline format.

- I. PROJECT DESCRIPTION: See attached Initial Study.
- II. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING: See attached Initial Study.
- III. DETERMINATION:

The City of San Diego conducted an Initial Study which determined that the proposed project could have a significant environmental effect in the following area(s): *Traffic Circulation/Transportation* and *Paleontological Resources*. Subsequent revisions in the project proposal create the specific mitigation identified in Section V of this Mitigated Negative Declaration. The project as revised now avoids or mitigates the potentially significant environmental effects previously identified, and the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report will not be required.

- IV. DOCUMENTATION:

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

- V. MITIGATION, MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM:

To ensure that site development would avoid significant environmental impacts, a Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Program (MMRP) is required. Compliance with

the mitigation measures would be the responsibility of the applicant. The basis for the MMRP can be found in the Initial Study. The mitigation measures are described below.

General

1. Prior to the issuance of any construction permit, the applicant shall pay the Long Term Monitoring Fee in accordance with the Development Services Department Fee Schedule to cover the City's cost associated with implementation of the Mitigation, Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP).
2. Prior to the issuance of a Notice to Proceed (NTP) or any permits, including but not limited to, the first Grading Permit, Demolition Plans/Permits and Building Plans/Permits, the Assisted Deputy Director (ADD) of the City's Land Development Review Division (LDR) shall verify that the following statement is shown on the grading and/or construction plans as a note under the heading *Environmental Requirements*: "Sharp Hospital project is subject to a Mitigation, Monitoring and Reporting Program and shall conform to the mitigation conditions as contained in the Mitigated Negative Declaration 6839."

Traffic Circulation/Transportation

Prior to the issuance of any Certificates of Occupancy, the owner/permittee shall implement the following mitigation measures into the project design to the satisfaction of the ADD of LDR and the City Engineer:

1. Provide a northbound exclusive right-turn lane on Health Center Drive approaching Frost Street.
2. As an interim measure restripe Frost Street between Health Center Drive and Childrens Way to prohibit parking and provide a two-way left-turn lane within the current curb-to-curb width of 40-feet.
3. Provide an Irrevocable Offer of Dedication on Health Center Drive along the Sharp Hospital frontage to provide 70 feet of right-of-way.
4. Provide an Irrevocable Offer of Dedication to provide 68 feet curb-to-curb and 88 feet of right-of-way on Frost Street along the Sharp Hospital frontage. The 88-feet shall be evenly split by abutting property owners, 44 feet on each side. Widen south half of Frost Street from Health Center Drive approximately 370 feet east to Sharp parking structure driveway, plus transition when warranted, satisfactory to the City Engineer.

Paleontological Resources

Prior to Preconstruction Meeting

1. *Land Development Review (LDR) Plan Check*

Prior to the issuance of a Notice to Proceed (NTP) or any permits, including but not limited to, the first Grading Permit, Demolition Plans/Permits and Building Plans/Permits,

the Assistant Deputy Director (ADD) of Land Development Review (LDR) shall verify that the requirements for Paleontological Monitoring have been noted on the appropriate construction documents.

2. *Letters of Qualification have been Submitted to the ADD*

Prior to the recordation of the first final map, NTP, or any permits, including but not limited to, issuance of the first Grading Permit, Demolition Plans/Permits and Building Plans/Permits, the applicant shall provide a letter of verification to the ADD of LDR stating that a qualified Paleontologist, as defined in the City of San Diego Paleontological Guidelines, has been retained to implement the monitoring program.

3. *Second Letter Containing Names of Monitors has been sent to Mitigation Monitoring Coordination (MMC)*

a. At least thirty days prior to the Preconstruction (Precon) Meeting, a second letter shall be submitted to MMC which shall include the name of the Principal Investigator (PI) and the names of all persons involved in the Paleontological Monitoring of the project.

b. MMC will provide Plan Check with a copy of both the first and second letter.

4. *Records Search Prior to Precon Meeting*

At least thirty days (30) prior to the Precon Meeting, the qualified Paleontologist shall verify that a records search has been completed, and updated as necessary, and be prepared to introduce any pertinent information concerning expectations and probabilities of discovery during trenching and/or grading activities. Verification includes, but is not limited to, a copy of a confirmation letter from the San Diego Natural History Museum, other institution, or, if the record search was in-house, a letter of verification from the PI stating that the search was completed.

Preconstruction Meeting

1. *Monitor Shall Attend Precon Meetings*

a. Prior to beginning of any work that requires monitoring, the Applicant shall arrange a Precon Meeting that shall include the Paleontologist, Construction Manager and/or Grading Contractor, Resident Engineer (RE), Building inspector (BI), and MMC. The qualified Paleontologist shall attend any grading related Precon Meetings to make comments and/or suggestions concerning the Paleontological Monitoring Program with the Construction Manager and/or Grading Contractor.

- b. If the Monitor is not able to attend the Precon Meeting, the RE, or BI as appropriate, will schedule a focused Precon Meeting for MMC, Monitors, Construction Manager and appropriate Contractors representatives to meet and review the job on-site prior to start of any work that requires monitoring.

2. *Identify Areas to be Monitored*

At the Precon Meeting, the Paleontologist shall submit to MMC a copy of the site/grading plan (reduced to 11x17) that identifies areas to be monitored.

3. *When Monitoring Will Occur*

Prior to the start of work, the Paleontologist also shall submit a construction schedule to MMC through the RE, or BI, as appropriate, indicating when and where monitoring is to begin and shall notify MMC of the start date for monitoring.

During Construction

1. *Monitor Shall be Present During Grading/Excavation*

The qualified Paleontologist shall be present full-time during the initial cutting of previously undisturbed formations with high and moderate resource sensitivity, and shall document activity via the Consultant Site Visit Record (form). This record shall be faxed to the RE, or BI as appropriate, and MMC each month.

2. *Discoveries*

a. MINOR PALEONTOLOGICAL DISCOVERY

In the event of a minor Paleontological discovery (small pieces of broken common shell fragments or other scattered common fossils) the Paleontologist shall notify the RE, or BI as appropriate, that a minor discovery has been made. The determination of significance shall be at the discretion of the qualified Paleontologist. The Paleontologist will continue to monitor the area and immediately notify the RE, or BI as appropriate, if a potential significant discovery emerges.

b. SIGNIFICANT PALEONTOLOGICAL DISCOVERY

In the event of a significant Paleontological discovery, and when requested by the Paleontologist, the city RE, or BI as appropriate, shall be notified and shall divert, direct, or temporarily halt construction activities in the area of discovery to allow recovery of fossil remains. The determination of significance shall be at the discretion of the qualified Paleontologist. The Paleontologist with Principal Investigator (PI) level evaluation responsibilities shall also immediately notify MMC

staff of such finding at the time of discovery. MMC staff will coordinate with appropriate LDR staff.

3. *Night Work*

a. If night work is included in the contract

(1) When night work is included in the contract package, the extent and timing shall be presented and discussed at the precon meeting.

(2) The following procedures shall be followed:

(a) NO DISCOVERIES

In the event that nothing was found during the night work, The PI will record the information on the Site Visit Record Form.

(b) MINOR DISCOVERIES

(1) All Minor Discoveries will be processed and documented using the existing procedures under **During Construction** (see Section 2. *Discoveries*, Subsection a.), with the exception that the RE will contact MMC by 9 A.M. the following morning.

(c) POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT DISCOVERIES

(1) If the PI determines that a potentially significant discovery has been made, the procedures under **During Construction** (see Section 2. *Discoveries*, Subsection b.), will be followed, with the exception that the RE will contact MMC by 9 A.M. the following morning to report and discuss the findings.

b. If night work becomes necessary during the course of construction

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

(2) The RE, or BI, as appropriate, will notify MMC immediately.

c. All other procedures described above will apply, as appropriate.

4. *Notification of Completion*

The Paleontologist shall notify MMC and the RE, or BI as appropriate, of the end date of monitoring.

Post Construction

1. The Paleontologist shall be responsible for preparation of fossils to a point of curation as defined by the City of San Diego Paleontological Guidelines.

a. **SUBMIT LETTER OF ACCEPTANCE FROM LOCAL QUALIFIED CURATION FACILITY.**

The Paleontologist shall be responsible for submittal of a letter of acceptance to the ADD of LDR from a local qualified curation facility. A copy of this letter shall be forwarded to MMC.

b. **IF FOSSIL COLLECTION IS NOT ACCEPTED, CONTACT LDR FOR ALTERNATIVES**

If the fossil collection is not accepted by a local qualified curation facility for reasons other than inadequate preparation of specimens, the project Paleontologist shall contact LDR, to suggest an alternative disposition of the collection. MMC shall be notified in writing of the situation and resolution.

c. **RECORDING SITES WITH SAN DIEGO NATURAL HISTORY MUSEUM**

The Paleontologist shall be responsible for the recordation of any discovered fossil sites at the San Diego Natural History Museum

d. **FINAL RESULTS REPORT**

a. Prior to the release of the grading bond, two copies of the Final Results Report (even if negative), which describes the results, analysis, and conclusions of the above Paleontological Monitoring Program (with appropriate graphics) shall be submitted to MMC for approval by the ADD of LDR.

b. MMC shall notify the RE or BI, as appropriate, of receipt of the Final Results Report.

VI. PUBLIC REVIEW DISTRIBUTION:

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

City of San Diego:
Councilmember Donna Frye, District 6

Development Services Department
County of San Diego
Department of Environmental Health, Hazardous Materials Management Division (75)
San Diego Natural History Museum (213)
Clairemont Mesa Planning Committee (248)
Serra Mesa Planning Group (263A)
Mary Johnson (263B)
Serra Mesa Community Council (264)
Kearny Mesa Community Planning Group (265)
Mission Village Homeowners Association (266)
Linda Vista Community Planning Committee (267)

VII. RESULTS OF PUBLIC REVIEW:

- () 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 of the Initial Study. No response is necessary. The letters are attached.
- (X) Comments addressing the findings 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 **Mitigated Negative Declaration**, the Mitigation, Monitoring and Reporting Program and any Initial Study material are available in the office of the Land Development Review Division for review, or for purchase at the cost of reproduction.



Anne Lowry, Senior Planner
Development Services Department

July 19, 2004
Date of Draft Report

August 20, 2004
Date of Final Report

Analyst: P. Schlitt



Serra Mesa Planning Group

Post Office Box 23315 San Diego, CA 92193

August 20, 2004

Paul Schlitt
Associate Planner
City of San Diego Development Services Center
1222 Fifth Avenue, MS 501
San Diego, CA 92101

RE: Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration, Project Number 6839

Dear Mr. Schlitt:

August
Following a presentation by Sharp Hospital representatives at the Serra Mesa Planning Group meeting on ~~September~~ *August* 19, 2004, we passed a motion to respond to the Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration. These are our issues:

- (1)
 - We don't believe eucalyptus trees are an appropriate choice of tree for the area, because of safety concerns. We would prefer an alternative to the eucalyptus tree.
- (2)
 - There's a definite need for a bus shelter on the west side of Health Center Drive. Many people including families with young children spend a long time waiting for the bus in an area without shade. They need the protection that a designated shelter would provide.

If you have any questions, you can contact me at 858-278-9660.

Cindy Moore
Chair, Serra Mesa Planning Group

Response to Comments

- (1) Comment noted. Due to the surrounding urban interface, the selection on the type of landscape trees required to be incorporated into the project design would not be considered as a potentially significant environmental impact per the City of San Diego Significance Determination Guidelines under the California Environmental Quality Act. However, this request will be forwarded to the landscape reviewing staff in the Development Services Department.
- (2) Comment noted. The issue does not pertain to the adequacy of the environmental analysis. However, these concerns will be forward to Chris Kulth, San Diego Association of Governments for consideration on whether options are available to incorporate a transit shelter at this bus stop.

City of San Diego
Development Services Department
LAND DEVELOPMENT REVIEW DIVISION
1222 First Avenue, Mail Station 501
San Diego, CA 92101
(619) 446-5460

INITIAL STUDY
Project No. 6839

SUBJECT: Sharp Hospital: CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT (CUP No. 11504), PLANNED DEVELOPMENT PERMIT (PDP No. 11505), and amendment to CUP No. 88-1297 and 41-0408 to construct a seven-story, 117-foot-tall, 315,621-square-foot hospital building and demolish five floors of an existing nine-story hospital building (North Tower). The project would demolish 272 parking spaces on-site to allow for the construction of the proposed hospital building, and construct 47 new parking spaces on-site. The site is located on a four-acre site at 7901 Frost Street, in the CO-1-2 zone of the Serra Mesa Community Plan area (Parcel 1 of Parcel Map 5131). Applicant: Sharp Healthcare.

Update: Minor revisions to this document have been made when compared to the draft Mitigated Negative Declaration. The changes do not affect the environmental analysis or conclusion of this document. All revisions are shown in a strike/underline format.

I. PURPOSE AND MAIN FEATURES:

The project proposes a CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT (CUP) and PLANNED DEVELOPMENT PERMIT (PDP) that would allow for the construction of a seven-story, 315,621-square-foot clinical care tower and demolition of a portion of the existing north hospital tower (floors four through eight). The existing north tower is 117 feet in height. The 3.7-acre redevelopment site is located at 7901 Frost Street and is situated within the north end of the entire 127-acre Sharp Metropolitan Medical Campus (see Figure 2). The proposed hospital building would be connected to remaining portion of the north tower (at the first and second floor levels). The project would result in the removal of 290 hospital beds from the north tower, and the addition of 302 patient beds, 10 operating suites, 37 emergency bays, 10 emergency observation beds, a new lobby, and a family care pavilion on each patient floor within this newly proposed building. Also, future improvements would include a 32-inpatient bed and two surgical suites. The partial demolition of the north tower would occur after completion of the new building, to facilitate the transfer of hospital beds. The project would also demolish 272 existing parking spaces and construct 47 new parking spaces on-site (see Figure 3). The site would be accessed from Health Center Drive and Frost Street.

The following timeline has been established for the completion of the hospital modernization project: completion in April 2004 by the Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development for the review and permitting of the proposed project; construction of the new replacement clinical care tower from August 2004 to February 2007; demolition of the north tower in the spring of 2007; and renovation of the existing base of the north tower to occur from Spring 2007 to Spring 2008.

The project includes a request to deviate from the height limit of the underlying CO-1-2 zone (60 feet) to allow a maximum building height of 117-feet, 9-inches. The proposed project construction involves the demolition of the existing 117-foot-high north tower and constructing a new tower of the same height (see Figure 4, 5 & 6). The height deviation is

required to accommodate this structure on a site that currently has other constraints that preclude build out. This proposed deviation would allow the additional height that is needed to modernize and upgrade the existing hospital complex and replace an existing structure of comparable height that currently does not meet state seismic safety standards.

The proposed new hospital tower would be designed in the shape of a chevron and would feature a variety of architectural elements such as curved corner, changes in exterior materials (cement plaster over existing precast concrete panels), and use of color and landscaping to offset excessive bulk and scale (see Figure 7).

The four-acre project site would require 11,580 cubic yards of soil excavation to a maximum depth of 15 feet, and 1,900 cubic yards of fill to a maximum height of two feet. The excavation is required for the basement that is associated with the construction of the seven-story tower. There is an existing mature Torrey pine tree on the property that is located close to the existing sidewalk adjacent to Health Center Drive. There would be a mitigation requirement for traffic/circulation impacts associated with the project that would necessitate an additional right-of-way to be provided on the east side of Health Center Drive (right-turn-only lane onto Frost Street). The Torrey pine would be removed as a condition of this traffic/circulation mitigation. The removal of this tree would be offset by replacing it with five, 48-inch boxed Torrey pine trees on-site. All landscaping would comply with the Land Development Manual - Landscape Standards (2000). A variety of street trees and shrubs would be planted along all vehicle use areas to provide the appropriate screening effect. The remainder of the grounds would be landscaped with a variety of ornamental shrubs, groundcovers, vines and grass.

II. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING:

The project site has been previously developed and is relatively level. The site is zoned CO-1-2 and is located within the Serra Mesa Community Plan area. The land use designation for the Sharp Memorial Hospital site is "institutional". This land use designation also applies to the larger 127-acre Health-Institution Complex (of which this project is a part) that is located between State Route 163 and Interstate 805 (see Figure 1). The institutional/health care center includes the existing Sharp Memorial Hospital, Mary Birch Hospital for Women, Rees-Stealy Medical office building, Mesa Vista hospital and other treatment and rehabilitation centers, medical offices and educational facilities. The Children's hospital is located to the east of the Sharp Metropolitan Medical Campus. This project is part of the larger Sharp Hospital Modernization project and is consistent with the Health-Institutional Complex use.

The proposed 117-foot tall building would be physically buffered from residential development by State Route 163 and Interstate 805, which converge approximately one-quarter mile to the north. The nearest residential areas are located to the north of Kearny Villa Road and to the west of the State Route (SR) 163. The area north of the building site between Frost Street and Kearny Villa road is designated institutional health care. The institutional/health care center area continues south of the building site approximately one-half mile to Genesee Avenue. There are no residential uses in the immediate vicinity.

The location of the proposed development is within an existing urbanized area currently served by public services such as police, fire, and emergency medical. The location of the proposed development approximately 1.1 miles from the City of San Diego Fire Station 28, which is located at 3880 Kearny Villa Road. Response time from this station to the project site is approximately three minutes. The project is located within the City's Police Departments eastern division, which reported an average response time of 7.8 minutes in

2002. This proposed development would not affect these response times as this area is already served.

The project site is not within or adjacent to the City's Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA). Also, no narrow endemic or sensitive native vegetation exist on-site.

III. ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS: See attached Initial Study checklist.

IV. DISCUSSION:

The reports referenced below are available for review in the office of the Land Development Review Division (LDR) of the Development Services Department (DSD), 1222 First Avenue, 5th Floor, San Diego, CA 92101.

The following environmental issues were considered during review and determined to be significant.

Traffic Circulation/Transportation

An evaluation of the potential traffic impacts associated with the Sharp Hospital project was prepared by Linscott, Law and Greenspan, the results of which are contained in the report entitled, "Traffic Impact Analysis Frost Street Future Configuration City of San Diego, California", dated May 17, 2004. The report included analysis and recommendations on the ultimate configuration and right-of-way for Frost Street between Health Center Drive and Childrens Way and for Health Center Drive south of Frost Street. In addition to considering the potential traffic/parking related impacts associated with this portion of the expansion (planned increase in the bed count by 12 beds), the report also included analysis on the future expansion of Children's Hospital, which proposes to increase the bed count by 39 beds and expand the surgical outpatient center by 11,050 square feet.

Frost Street between Health Center Drive and Childrens Way is currently constructed as a 40-foot wide roadway providing one lane of travel in each direction and parking on each side. It provides access to Children's Hospital, Sharp Hospital and various ancillary medical services. Health Center Drive south of Frost Street is currently constructed as a 40-foot wide roadway providing one lane of travel in each direction. It provides access to Sharp Hospital physician parking and patient drop-off via a driveway located 400-feet south of Frost Street and to the Sharp Hospital main parking structure via a driveway located 700-feet south of Frost Street. Frost Street is signalized at Health Center Drive and an all-way stop is present at Childrens Way.

The existing average daily traffic (ADT) volume for Frost Street was determined by a three-day traffic count conducted near the midpoint of Frost Street (4,400 ADT reported). An additional three-day count was conducted on Frost Street just east of Health Center Drive and just west of Childrens Way with 10,400 ADT's and 4,000 ADT's, counted respectively. Prior City of San Diego Year 2001 traffic counts indicated an ADT of 5,360. Also, traffic counts for Health Center Drive were reported at 10,850 ADTs (City of San Diego 2001). This count was increased by 3.8 percent per year to obtain a 2004 volume of 12,100.

The traffic analysis factored in three projects that are currently proposed for construction within the vicinity of Frost Street. They include the planned increase in the number of patient beds for Children's Hospital and Sharp Memorial Hospital and the proposed demolition of existing medical office buildings on the northeast corner of Frost Street/Health Center Drive intersection and replacing it with an approximately 160,000- square-foot

medical office building (identified as Cambridge). The analysis assumed that these projects would add traffic directly to Frost Street.

Year 2020 ADT volumes were obtained utilizing data from the City of San Diego and SANDAG projections. An ADT of 12,000 was used in the analysis for Frost Street adjacent to Childrens Way. An ADT of 16,000 was assumed for Frost adjacent to Health Center Drive. An ADT of 15,500 was assumed for the Year 2020 on Health Center Drive south of Frost Street.

In the near term scenario analysis the existing and projected intersection Levels of Service (LOS) were identified as operating at an LOS D in association with the existing lane configurations (Health Center Drive/Frost Street and Berger Avenue-Childrens Way/Frost Street). Under 2020 conditions, the intersection of Health Center Drive/Frost Street was identified to operate at LOS F under the AM and PM peak periods. In near term and 2020 street segment operation scenarios for the existing and projected roadway segment operations on Frost Street (adjacent to Health Center Drive and Childrens Way) the ADT value varied from one end of Frost Street to the other. The westerly end of Frost Street was identified to operate at LOS F under existing, existing plus project, and 2020 conditions without improvement. With improvements the westerly portion of Frost Street was reported to operate at LOS C. The easterly end of Frost Street was identified to operate at LOS C under existing, LOS E under existing plus project and LOS F under 2020 conditions. With improvements, this segment was calculated to operate at LOS B under existing conditions plus project and LOS D under 2020 conditions.

The existing and projected segment operations were also calculated for Health Center Drive south of Frost Street. In its current two-lane configuration, Health Center Drive operates at LOS F under existing conditions, existing plus project conditions and Year 2020 conditions. However, when it is widened to a four-lane roadway a LOS C for the 2020 condition would result. The study also noted that under existing plus project operations at the Frost Street/Health Center Drive intersection an LOS C or better during peak operating hours could be achieved.

The 2020 peak hour analysis at the Frost Street/Childrens Way/Berger Avenue intersection showed that LOS B or better operations occur even if all volumes are doubled from existing conditions. The report concluded that Frost Street does not need to be four lanes at Childrens Way unless dual northbound lefts were needed.

Furthermore, the study concluded that based on the 2003 existing traffic counts, traffic projections for all known projects in the area which could be built in the next few years, and SANDAG and City of San Diego Year 2020 traffic forecasts, the improvement of Frost Street to provide 68 feet curb-to-curb on the westerly portion and a two-lane roadway with a two way left-turn lane with 54 feet curb-to-curb on the easterly portion would provide adequate capacity to accommodate traffic volumes.

The project has been designed to enhance safety and traffic flow and is subject to all City Engineering Safety Standards. Transportation/Circulation mitigation has been incorporated into the Mitigation, Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) and would be made conditions of the development Permits (see Section V of the attached Mitigated Negative Declaration [MND]). Compliance with the MMRP would reduce direct project impacts to below a level of significance.

Paleontological Resources

According to the "Geology of the San Diego Metropolitan Area, California, La Mesa, 7^{1/2} Minute Quadrangle (Kennedy and Peterson, 1975), the majority of the project area is underlain by the Lindavista geologic formation. The Lindavista formation has produced very rare marine fossils and has been assigned a moderate resource potential for fossils. In association with the proposed construction, the project would excavate approximately 11,580 cubic yards of soil to a maximum depth of 15 feet. The proposed grading for this project exceeds the City's thresholds of significance for potential impacts to paleontological resources. These construction activities would potentially impact paleontological resources. Disturbance or loss of fossils without adequate documentation and research would be considered a significant environmental impact. Therefore, a MMRP as detailed in Section V of the MND would be implemented. The program would require a qualified Paleontologist or Paleontological Monitor be present during all ground excavations that would exceed ten feet in depth and that could impact portions of the previously undisturbed Lindavista formation. If paleontological resources were discovered, a recovery and documentation program would be implemented. With implementation of the MMRP, impacts to paleontology would be below a level of significance.

The following environmental issues were considered during the environmental review of the project and determined not to be significant.

Human Health/Public Safety/Hazardous Materials

The project proposes to demolish five floors (floors four through eight) of the nine-story north tower, which was built in 1973. An asbestos survey and abatement plan was completed in 1991 by Design for Health, Inc. for the entire Sharp Health Institutional Complex. The survey identified all building structures and components within the Complex that contained asbestos. The plan specifies the method of removal and/or encapsulation of all asbestos-containing building structures and components. The project would be required to comply with all applicable local and state regulations, including OSHA 29 CFR 1926.1101, "Safety and Health Regulations for Construction -- Asbestos", to minimize potential risks to human health and the environment. The report concluded that future demolition activities would require that proper precautions be made during the removal and disposal of asbestos containing materials. This environmental issue is regulated by state agencies (Cal-OSHA and Cal-EPA), and the San Diego Air Pollution Control District and the County of San Diego Department of Health Services, to ensure that toxic materials create no hazards to the demolition crew, adjacent residents, or other individuals. The issuance of demolition/removal permits by the City of San Diego would require the completion of a General Application (DS-3032) and a Hazardous Materials Questionnaire (DS-3163) when a commercial structure or building is proposed to be demolished. In accordance with the Land Development Code, a demolition permit would not be issued until a decision has been made by the appropriate decision maker concerning approval of the project's discretionary permits. Overall, implementation of these conditions associated with the demolition/removal permit would reduce the potential human health/public safety impacts to the residential development to below a level of significance and no additional mitigation would be required.

Hydrology

The project site is located in the Penasquitos Hydrologic Unit (906.00), Tecolote Hydrologic Area (906.5). The site generally drains from the northeast to the southwest, with slopes

ranging from approximately 2.8 percent in the northeast, to 7 percent in the middle of the site, and 2.5 percent in the southwest portion of the site. The existing site drains to street inlets located on Health Center Drive that are piped across State Route 163 in a westerly direction and discharged to an open channel just south of TOBB Center Development. Storm water is eventually collected within a 30-inch RCP pipe just east of Vista Road where from this conveyance system it is eventually discharged to the Pacific Ocean near Mission Bay.

Water Quality

Per the City of San Diego Storm Water Manual and the completed Storm Water Requirements Applicability Checklist, this development was identified as a "priority project", and required the completion of a Water Quality Technical Report. A Water Quality Technical Report, entitled *Sharp Hospital Skilled Nursing Tower Replacement Storm Water Quality Technical Report*, prepared by Martin & Ziemniak Civil Engineering and Land Surveying, dated ~~October 21, 2003~~ July 9, 2004, has been reviewed and approved by the City Engineer. Based on the Water Quality Technical Report, the project would result in negligible changes in drainage pattern, and no net change in site hydrology is anticipated.

The Water Quality Technical Report addressed potential water quality impacts during both construction and post-construction phases of the project. To comply with current National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) pre-construction requirements, a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) would be prepared for the project. The SWPPP would be prepared at the time of the construction drawings. Elements would include appropriate erosion and sediment controls, periodic and storm-related inspection procedures during the wet and dry seasons, general housekeeping practices, training and materials management (see Figure 8). The primary focus of the SWPPP would be to prevent contaminated runoff from leaving the construction site through the existing storm drain systems. Onsite *Best Management Practices* (BMPs) would include slope stabilization, stockpile controls, gravel bags, fiber rolls, inlet protection devices, and sediment traps.

To address potential post-construction water quality impacts the Water Quality Technical Report identified the expected pollutants that might occur as a result of developing the site and incorporate the appropriate BMPs to treat those pollutants. In accordance with Table 2, Section III of the City's Storm Water Standards Manual, the anticipated pollutants of concern from the project area include sediment, nutrients, oxygen demanding substances, heavy metals, oil and grease (primarily from uncovered parking lots), and pesticides (contributors include landscape areas and improper waste management). Structural treatment BMPs would include two stormceptors equipped with fossil filters as structural treatment and long-term BMPs. Roof drains would be directed to the storm drain system. Pervious materials, such as porous concrete and pavers, would be used where practical to increase infiltration. Post-construction/operational or long-term mitigation measures in the form of structural BMPs would be required to be maintained by the property owner. Thus, incorporation of these BMPs into the project design would lessen any impacts to water quality by the project to below a level of significance.

IV. RECOMMENDATION:

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

— The proposed project would not have a significant effect on the environment, and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** should be prepared.

- X Although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described in Section IV above have been added to the project. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION should be prepared.
- The proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT should be required.

PROJECT ANALYST: Schlitt

- Attachments: Initial Study Checklist
- Figure 1. Location Map
 - Figure 2. Composite Site Plan
 - Figure 3. Site Plan of Existing Conditions with Demolition
 - Figure 4. Building Elevations
 - Figure 5. Exterior Elevations (North and West)
 - Figure 6. Exterior Elevations (South and East)
 - Figure 7. Building Façade (North Side)
 - Figure 8. Water Quality BMPs (Construction Phase)

Initial Study Checklist

Date: October 2, 2003

Project No.: 6839

Name of Project: Sharp Hospital

III. ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS:

The purpose of the Initial Study is to identify the potential for significant environmental impacts which could be associated with a project pursuant to Section 15063 of the State CEQA Guidelines. In addition, the Initial Study provides the lead agency with information which forms the basis for deciding whether to prepare an Environmental Impact Report, Negative Declaration or Mitigated Negative Declaration. This Checklist provides a means to facilitate early environmental assessment. However, subsequent to this preliminary review, modifications to the project may mitigate adverse impacts. All answers of "yes" and "maybe" indicate that there is a potential for significant environmental impacts and these determinations are explained in Section IV of the Initial Study.

Yes Maybe No

I. AESTHETICS / NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER – Will the proposal result in:

- | | <u>Yes</u> | <u>Maybe</u> | <u>No</u> |
|--|------------|--------------|-----------|
| A. The obstruction of any vista or scenic view from a public viewing area?
<u>The proposed project is for the construction of a seven-story, 117-foot-tall hospital building. The bulk and scale of this new building would be similar to the adjacent nine-story building that is proposed to be demolished, and the 11 story building (136 feet tall) that is also adjacent to the location of this proposed new construction. The project includes a request to deviate from the height limit of the underlying CO-1-2 zone and to allow a maximum building height of 117'9". The project would not alter the existing visual character of the area, or obstruct any scenic view or vista.</u> | — | — | <u>X</u> |
| B. The creation of a negative aesthetic site or project?
<u>The proposed project would not create a aesthetically negative site. See I. A.</u> | — | — | <u>X</u> |
| C. Project bulk, scale, materials, or style which would be incompatible with surrounding development?
<u>The proposed project's bulk, scale, and materials</u> | — | — | <u>X</u> |

- would be similar to the existing structures on the medical campus and would be compatible with the surrounding development and consistent with the Serra Mesa Community Plan.
- D. Substantial alteration to the existing character of the area? — — X
The proposed construction would replace an existing multi-story building with another multi-story structure of similar size and height and subsequently would not substantially alter in the existing character of the area.
-
- E. The loss of any distinctive or landmark tree(s), or a stand of mature trees? — X —
A single Torrey pine trees exists within the project footprint. The lose of this tree would be offset by the planting of five of new 24" box Torrey Pine trees. See initial study discussion under Purpose and Main Feature discussion.
- F. Substantial change in topography or ground surface relief features? — — X
The project would not substantially alter the existing topography or any surface relief features. In association with the construction of this seven-story building grading, earthwork in the amount of 11,580 cubic yards with a maximum excavation depth of 15 feet would be associated with the project.
- G. The loss, covering or modification of any unique geologic or physical features such as a natural canyon, sandstone bluff, rock outcrop or hillside with a slope in excess of 25 percent? — — X
The site has been previously graded and no unique geologic or physical land features exist on-site.
- H. Substantial light or glare? — — X
The proposed project would feature standard lighting allowed by existing City ordinances.
- I. Substantial shading of other properties? — — X
Substantial shading of other properties would not result from project implementation, as the project would conform to all applicable setback and design feature standards.

II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES / NATURAL RESOURCES / MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the proposal result in:

- | | | | |
|---|---|---|----------|
| A. The loss of availability of a known mineral resource (e.g., sand or gravel) that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?
<u>The existing site is surrounded by hospital use. The area would not be suitable for mineral extraction or agricultural use.</u> | — | — | <u>X</u> |
| B. The conversion of agricultural land to nonagricultural use or impairment of the agricultural productivity of agricultural land?
<u>The project would not result in the conversion of agricultural land.</u> | — | — | <u>X</u> |

III. AIR QUALITY – Would the proposal:

- | | | | |
|--|---|---|----------|
| A. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?
<u>The proposed seven-story, 315,621-square-foot building for hospital use is compatible with the underlying zone and would not result in the alteration of ambient air quality or the obstruction of implementing the regional air quality plan.</u> | — | — | <u>X</u> |
| B. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?
<u>Sharp Hospital would be required to comply with all applicable local, state, and federal regulations regarding chemicals and other potential airborne pollutants.</u> | — | — | <u>X</u> |
| C. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?
<u>See III. B.</u> | — | — | <u>X</u> |
| D. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?
<u>See III. B.</u> | — | — | <u>X</u> |
| E. Exceed 100 pounds per day of Particulate Matter 10 (dust)? | — | — | <u>X</u> |

Yes Maybe No

See IV. A.

F. An impact on City, State, or federally regulated wetlands (including, but not limited to, coastal salt marsh, vernal pool, lagoon, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption or other means?
See IV. A.

— — X

G. Conflict with the provisions of the City's Multiple Species Conservation Program Subarea Plan or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan?
The project site is not within the Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA) and would not conflict with the MSCP Subarea Plan.

— — X

V. ENERGY – Would the proposal:

A. Result in the use of excessive amounts of fuel or energy (e.g. natural gas)?
The proposed project would not result in the use of excessive amounts of fuel, energy, or power.

— — X

B. Result in the use of excessive amounts of power?
See V. A.

— — X

VI. GEOLOGY/SOILS – Would the proposal:

A. Expose people or property to geologic hazards such as earthquakes, landslides, mudslides, ground failure, or similar hazards?
The site is within Geologic Hazard Zone 52; Low to moderate risk.

— — X

B. Result in a substantial increase in wind or water erosion of soils, either on or off the site?
See VI. A.

— — X

C. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?
The project would not be located on an unstable geologic unit.

— — X

VII. HISTORICAL RESOURCES – Would the proposal result in:

- | | | | |
|--|---|---|----------|
| A. Alteration of or the destruction of a prehistoric or historic archaeological site?
<u>The project site is located on a previously developed lot which is not located in a high resource sensitivity area, according to EAS's Historic Resource Sensitivity Maps. The project would not impact any sensitive historical or religious sites, objects, or structures exist on the property.</u> | — | — | <u>X</u> |
| B. Adverse physical or aesthetic effects to a prehistoric or historic building, structure, object, or site?
<u>See VII. A.</u> | — | — | <u>X</u> |
| C. Adverse physical or aesthetic effects to an architecturally significant building, structure, or object?
<u>No architecturally significant building or structures exist on-site. See VII. A.</u> | — | — | <u>X</u> |
| D. Any impact to existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area?
<u>No existing religious or sacred uses are located on-site.</u> | — | — | <u>X</u> |
| E. The disturbance of any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?
<u>See VII. A.</u> | — | — | <u>X</u> |

VIII. HUMAN HEALTH / PUBLIC SAFETY / HAZARDOUS MATERIALS: Would the proposal:

- | | | | |
|--|---|---|----------|
| A. Create any known health hazard (excluding mental health)?
<u>Sharp Memorial Community Hospital is currently under permit (Permit No.114292) with the San Diego Department of Environmental Health, Hazardous Materials Management Division. Through a Unified Program Facility Permit the hospital is permitted for the handling of infectious, biomedical, and chemical-related wastes. The project would not create any new health hazard. In regards to the proposed building demolition a notice would be given to the County Air Pollution Control District. Asbestos</u> | — | — | <u>X</u> |
|--|---|---|----------|

abatement specification guidelines for Sharp Memorial Hospital (dated November 12, 1991) are on file with the Facilities engineering section of Sharp Memorial Hospital. All demolition debris would be disposed of in an approved landfill. Refer to City of San Diego Development Services Information Bulletin 119. See Initial Study Discussion, Section IV. Human Health/Public Safety.

- | | | |
|--|--------------|-----------------|
| <p>B. Expose people or the environment to a significant hazard through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials?
 <u>No recorded releases of hazardous materials have occurred on the project site. Sharp Hospital would be required to comply with all applicable local, state and federal regulations related to hazardous materials management and hospital use.</u></p> | <p>— —</p> | <p><u>X</u></p> |
| <p>C. Create a future risk of an explosion or the release of hazardous substances (including but not limited to gas, oil, pesticides, chemicals, radiation, or explosives)?
 <u>No future health and safety risk is reasonably foreseeable in association with the development proposal.</u></p> | <p>— —</p> | <p><u>X</u></p> |
| <p>D. Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?
 <u>The project conforms to the land use plans and is capable of being served with existing emergency services located in the Serra Mesa Community Plan.</u></p> | <p>— —</p> | <p><u>X</u></p> |
| <p>E. 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, create a significant hazard to the public or environment?
 <u>See VIII. A.</u></p> | <p>— —</p> | <p><u>X</u></p> |
| <p>F. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?
 <u>See VIII. A.</u></p> | <p>— —</p> | <p><u>X</u></p> |

Yes Maybe No

IX. HYDROLOGY/WATER QUALITY – Would the proposal result in:

- | | Yes | Maybe | No |
|--|-----|-------|----------|
| <p>A. An increase in pollutant discharges, including down stream sedimentation, to receiving waters during or following construction? Consider water quality parameters such as temperature dissolved oxygen, turbidity and other typical storm water pollutants.
 <u>The project would reduce the total number of surface parking spaces on-site. The project also proposes two structural Best Management Practices to treat the runoff from the new, smaller parking lot. The proposed development would include project features designed in accordance with the City of San Diego Storm Water Standards. See Initial Study Discussion, Section IV, Hydrology/Water Quality.</u></p> | – | – | <u>X</u> |
| <p>B. An increase in impervious surfaces and associated increased runoff?
 <u>The project would not result in an increase in impervious surfaces. The existing site is developed in its entirety.</u></p> | – | – | <u>X</u> |
| <p>C. Substantial alteration to on- and off-site drainage patterns due to changes in runoff flow rates or volumes?
 <u>See IX. A.</u></p> | – | – | <u>X</u> |
| <p>D. Discharge of identified pollutants to an already impaired water body (as listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303(b) list)?
 <u>See IX. A.</u></p> | – | – | <u>X</u> |
| <p>E. A potentially significant adverse impact on ground water quality?
 <u>Best Management Practices would be incorporated into the project design to reduce storm water pollutant discharges. See Initial Study Discussion, Section IV, Hydrology/Water Quality.</u></p> | – | – | <u>X</u> |
| <p>F. Cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses?
 <u>The project would not degrade or impact surface or ground water quality objectives or beneficial uses.</u></p> | – | – | <u>X</u> |

proposed seven-story, 315,621-square-foot building for hospital use.

B. Exposure of people to noise levels which exceed the City's adopted noise ordinance?
The project site is located adjacent to State Route 163. The California Building Code shall govern the allowable interior noise level of the proposed hospital building.

— — X

C. Exposure of people to current or future transportation noise levels which exceed standards established in the Transportation Element of the General Plan or an adopted airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan?
The project would not result in any of the above-referenced impacts.

— — X

XII. PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES: Would the proposal impact a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?
There is no record of any resource on site. The project is underlain by the Linda Vista geologic formation. This geologic formation has produced diverse fossil assemblages of marine invertebrates and terrestrial vertebrates, and is assigned a moderate paleontological resource sensitivity (Deméré, August 1994). Proposed grading is approximately 11,580 cubic yards of cut, with a maximum cut depth of approximately 15 feet. The project has the potential to impact buried paleontological resources. Monitoring would be required as the project site may have significant paleontological resources. Appropriate mitigation has been proposed. See MMRP and Section IV, Initial Study Discussion, Paleontological Resources.

— X —

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING – Would the proposal:

A. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?
The proposed seven-story, 315,621-square-foot building for hospital use would not induce population growth.

— — X

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>Maybe</u>	<u>No</u>
B. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? <u>The project would not displace or necessitate the construction of housing.</u>	—	—	<u>X</u>
C. Alter the planned location, distribution, density or growth rate of the population of an area? <u>The project would not alter the population of the community.</u>	—	—	<u>X</u>
XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES – Would the proposal have an effect upon, or result in a need for new or altered governmental services in any of the following areas:			
A. Fire protection? <u>Fire protection services are available.</u>	—	—	<u>X</u>
B. Police protection? <u>Police protection services are available.</u>	—	—	<u>X</u>
C. Schools? <u>The project is consistent with the community plan and would have no affect on school services.</u>	—	—	<u>X</u>
D. Parks or other recreational facilities? <u>The project is consistent with the community plan and would have no effect on parks and recreation facilities.</u>	—	—	<u>X</u>
E. Maintenance of public facilities, including roads? <u>The project is consistent with the community plan and thus adequate services are available for the maintenance of public facilities, including roads.</u>	—	—	<u>X</u>
F. Other governmental services? <u>Existing services would remain unaffected.</u>	—	—	<u>X</u>
XV. RECREATIONAL RESOURCES – Would the proposal result in:			
A. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	—	—	<u>X</u>

Yes Maybe No

The project does not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities.

- 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?
See XV. A.

— — X

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION – Would the proposal result in:

- A. Traffic generation in excess of specific/community plan allocation?

The project would not significantly exceed community plan allocation.

— — X

- B. An increase in projected traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system?

The proposed project would be expected to generate 6,680 average daily trips; however, as part of the project, use of 290 existing beds would be transferred over to the new 302 proposed beds, therefore, the net 12 beds and the additional 32 beds would generate a net increase of 880 ADT, including 79 (55-in: 24-out) morning peak-hour trips, and 88 (26-in: 62-out) afternoon peak-hour trips. Additional traffic analysis would be required per Land Development Review (LDR) – Transportation staff to conduct a study to identify the most appropriate lane configuration for Frost Street between Health Center Drive and Children’s Way and Health Center Drive immediately north and south of Frost Street. See Initial Study Discussion, Section IV, Transportation.

— X —

- C. An increased demand for off-site parking?
The project may impact existing parking within the hospital complex. See Initial Study, Discussion, Section IV, Transportation.

— X —

- D. Effects on existing parking?
See Initial Study, Discussion, Section IV, Transportation.

— X —

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>Maybe</u>	<u>No</u>
E. Substantial impact upon existing or planned transportation systems? <u>See Initial Study, Discussion, Section IV, Transportation.</u>	—	<u>X</u>	—
F. Alterations to present circulation movements including effects on existing public access to beaches, parks, or other open space areas? <u>See Initial Study, Discussion, Section IV, Transportation.</u>	—	<u>X</u>	—
G. Increase in traffic hazards for motor vehicles, bicyclists or pedestrians due to a proposed, non-standard design feature (e.g., poor sight distance or driveway onto an access-restricted roadway)? <u>Project would not increase traffic hazards for motor vehicles, bicyclists or pedestrians.</u>	—	—	<u>X</u>
H. A conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation models (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? <u>Project would not conflict with the adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation models.</u>	—	—	<u>X</u>
XVII. UTILITIES – Would the proposal result in a need for new systems, or require substantial alterations to existing utilities, including:			
A. Natural gas? <u>Existing utilities would not be affected.</u>	—	—	<u>X</u>
B. Communications systems? <u>Existing utilities would not be affected.</u>	—	—	<u>X</u>
C. Water? <u>Existing utilities would not be affected.</u>	—	—	<u>X</u>
D. Sewer? <u>Existing utilities would not be affected.</u>	—	—	<u>X</u>
E. Storm water drainage? <u>No change in drainage patterns is anticipated.</u>	—	—	<u>X</u>
F. Solid waste disposal? <u>Existing service would remain unaffected.</u>	—	—	<u>X</u>

Yes Maybe No

XVIII. WATER CONSERVATION – Would the proposal result in:

- | | | | |
|---|---|---|----------|
| A. Use of excessive amounts of water?
<u>The project would not require the use of excessive amounts of water.</u> | — | — | <u>X</u> |
| B. Landscaping which is predominantly non-drought resistant vegetation?
<u>Landscaping would be in compliance with the San Diego Landscape Technical Manual.</u> | — | — | <u>X</u> |

XIX. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:

- | | | | |
|---|---|----------|----------|
| A. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?
<u>The proposed seven-story, 315,621-square-foot building for hospital use has the potential to result in significant impacts to paleontological resources, parking, and transportation circulation.</u> | — | <u>X</u> | — |
| B. Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals? (A short-term impact on the environment is one which occurs in a relatively brief, definitive period of time while long-term impacts would endure well into the future.)
<u>The proposed project would not result in an impact to long-term environmental goals.</u> | — | — | <u>X</u> |
| C. Does the project have impacts which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (A project may impact on two or more separate resources where the impact on each resource is relatively small, but where the effect of the total of those impacts on the environment is significant.)
<u>The proposed project would not result in cumulative impacts.</u> | — | — | <u>X</u> |

Yes Maybe No

D. Does the project have environmental effects which would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

The project would not result in environmental effects which would cause substantial effects on human beings.

— — X

INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

REFERENCES

I. Aesthetics / Neighborhood Character

City of San Diego Progress Guide and General Plan.

Community Plan.

Local Coastal Plan.

II. Agricultural Resources / Natural Resources / Mineral Resources

City of San Diego Progress Guide and General Plan.

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Survey - San Diego Area, California, Part I and II, 1973.

California Department of Conservation - Division of Mines and Geology, Mineral Land Classification.

Division of Mines and Geology, Special Report 153 - Significant Resources Maps.

Site Specific Report: _____.

III. Air

California Clean Air Act Guidelines (Indirect Source Control Programs) 1990.

Regional Air Quality Strategies (RAQS) - APCD.

Site Specific Report: _____.

IV. Biology

City of San Diego, Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP), Subarea Plan, 1997

City of San Diego, MSCP, "Vegetation Communities with Sensitive Species and Vernal Pools" maps, 1996.

City of San Diego, MSCP, "Multiple Habitat Planning Area" maps, 1997.

Community Plan - Resource Element.

California Department of Fish and Game, California Natural Diversity Database, "State and Federally-listed Endangered, Threatened, and Rare Plants of California," January 2001.

California Department of Fish & 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. Energy

VI. Geology/Soils

City of San Diego Seismic Safety Study.

U.S. Department of Agriculture Soil Survey - San Diego Area, California, Part I and II, December 1973 and Part III, 1975.

Site Specific Report: _____.

VII. Historical Resources

City of San Diego Historical Resources Guidelines.

City of San Diego Archaeology Library.

Historical Resources Board List.

Community Historical Survey:

Site Specific Report: _____

VIII. Human Health / Public Safety / Hazardous Materials

San Diego County Hazardous Materials Environmental Assessment Listing, 2004.

- San Diego County Hazardous Materials Management Division
- FAA Determination
- State Assessment and Mitigation, Unauthorized Release Listing, Public Use Authorized 1995.
- Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan.
- Site Specific Report: _____.

IX. Hydrology/Water Quality

- Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM).
- Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), National Flood Insurance Program - Flood Boundary and Floodway Map.
- Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list, dated July 2003, http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/tmdl/303d_lists.html.
- Site Specific Report: "Aero Drive III Southerly Aero Drive between Murphy Canyon Rd. and I-15 San Diego, CA", prepared by Stuart Engineering, dated January 28, 2004.

X. Land Use

- City of San Diego Progress Guide and General Plan.
- Community Plan.
- Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan
- City of San Diego Zoning Maps
- FAA Determination

XI. Noise

- Community Plan
- Site Specific Report: _____.
- San Diego International Airport - Lindbergh Field CNEL Maps.

- Brown Field Airport Master Plan CNEL Maps.
- Montgomery Field CNEL Maps.
- San Diego Association of Governments - San Diego Regional Average Weekday Traffic Volumes.
- San Diego Metropolitan Area Average Weekday Traffic Volume Maps, SANDAG.
- City of San Diego Progress Guide and General Plan.
- Site Specific Report: _____

XII. Paleontological Resources

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

XIII. Population / Housing

- City of San Diego Progress Guide and General Plan.
- Community Plan.
- Series 8 Population Forecasts, SANDAG.
- Other: _____

XIV. Public Services

- City of San Diego Progress Guide and General Plan.

Community Plan.

XV. Recreational Resources

City of San Diego Progress Guide and General Plan.

Community Plan.

Department of Park and Recreation

City of San Diego - San Diego Regional Bicycling Map

Additional Resources: _____.

XVI. Transportation / Circulation

City of San Diego Progress Guide and General Plan.

Community Plan.

San Diego Metropolitan Area Average Weekday Traffic Volume Maps, SANDAG.

San Diego Region Weekday Traffic Volumes, SANDAG.

Site Specific Report: _____.

XVII. Utilities

_____.

XVIII. Water Conservation

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