MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO

Project No. 528826
SCH No. N/A

SUBJECT: KRAMER CDP/SDP/TM

I. PROJECT DESCRIPTION: See attached Initial Study.

II. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING: See attached Initial Study.

III. DETERMINATION:

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

UPDATE: Please Note that changes within this document are identified in strikeout and added language is within an underlined format as it relates to the DRAFT document.

10/10/17: The following updates were made for the final document:

In the Initial Study on the first page in the project description, “Tentative Tract Map” was updated to “Tentative Map.”

The applicant’s name was updated in the Initial Study and the Distribution list.

There were two typographical errors: Page 12 Section V(c), noted an incorrect reference; Page 33 Section VII, noted the incorrect project name, and was struck out. However, the information noted remains accurate in both sections.

In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act, Section 15073.5(c)(4), the addition of new information that clarifies, amplifies, or makes insignificant modifications does not require recirculation as there are no new
impacts and no new mitigation identified. An environmental document needs only to be recirculated when there is the identification of new significant environmental impacts or the addition of a new mitigation measure is required to avoid a significant environmental impact. The modifications within the environmental document do not affect the environmental analysis or conclusions of the Mitigated Negative Declaration.

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

V. MITIGATION, MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM:

A. GENERAL REQUIREMENTS – PART I
   Plan Check Phase (prior to permit issuance)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

2. MMRP COMPLIANCE: This Project, Project Tracking System (PTS) # 528826 and/or Environmental Document # 528826, shall conform to the mitigation requirements contained in the associated Environmental Document and implemented to the satisfaction of the DSD’s Environmental Designee (MMC) and the City Engineer (RE). The requirements may not be reduced or changed but may be annotated (i.e. to explain when and how compliance is being met and location of verifying proof, etc.). Additional clarifying information may also be added to other relevant plan sheets and/or specifications as appropriate (i.e., specific locations, times of monitoring, methodology, etc).

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

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

Not Applicable

4. MONITORING EXHIBITS
All consultants are required to submit, to RE and MMC, a monitoring exhibit on a 11x17 reduction of the appropriate construction plan, such as site plan, grading, landscape, etc., marked to clearly show the specific areas including the LIMIT OF WORK, scope of that discipline’s work, and notes indicating when in the construction schedule that work will be performed. When necessary for clarification, a detailed methodology of how the work will be performed shall be included.

NOTE:
Surety and Cost Recovery – When deemed necessary by the Development Services Director or City Manager, additional surety instruments or bonds from the private Permit Holder may be required to ensure the long term performance or implementation of required mitigation
measures or programs. The City is authorized to recover its cost to offset the salary, overhead, and expenses for City personnel and programs to monitor qualifying projects.

5. OTHER SUBMITTALS AND INSPECTIONS:

The Permit Holder/Owner's representative shall submit all required documentation, verification letters, and requests for all associated inspections to the RE and MMC for approval per the following schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Submittal/Inspection Checklist</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Issue Area를</td>
<td>Document Submittal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>Consultant Qualification Letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>Consultant Construction Monitoring Exhibits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Resources (Archaeology)</td>
<td>Monitoring Report(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>Final Acoustical Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond Release</td>
<td>Request for a Bond Release Letter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. SPECIFIC MMRP ISSUE AREA CONDITIONS/REQUIREMENTS

HISTORICAL RESOURCES (ARCHAEOLOGY)

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

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

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

II. Prior to Start of Construction

A. Verification of Records Search

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

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

3. The PI may submit a detailed letter to MMC requesting a reduction to the 1/4 mile radius.

B. PI Shall Attend Precon Meetings

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

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

2. Identify Areas to be Monitored

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

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

3. When Monitoring Will Occur

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

B. Discovery Notification Process

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

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

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

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

C. Determination of Significance

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

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

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

IV. **Discovery of Human Remains**

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

A. **Notification**

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

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

B. **Isolate discovery site**

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

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

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

C. If Human Remains **ARE** determined to be Native American

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

2. NAHC will immediately identify the person or persons determined to be the Most Likely Descendent (MLD) and provide contact information.

3. The MLD will contact the PI within 24 hours or sooner after the Medical Examiner has completed coordination, to begin the consultation process in accordance with CEQA Section 15064.5(e), the California Public Resources and Health & Safety Codes.

4. The MLD will have 48 hours to make recommendations to the property owner or representative, for the treatment or disposition with proper dignity, of the human remains and associated grave goods.
5. Disposition of Native American Human Remains will be determined between the MLD and the PI, and, if:
   a. The NAHC is unable to identify the MLD, OR the MLD failed to make a recommendation within 48 hours after being notified by the Commission; OR;
   b. The landowner or authorized representative rejects the recommendation of the MLD and mediation in accordance with PRC 5097.94 (k) by the NAHC fails to provide measures acceptable to the landowner, THEN,
   c. In order to protect these sites, the Landowner shall do one or more of the following:
      (1) Record the site with the NAHC;
      (2) Record an open space or conservation easement on the site;
      (3) Record a document with the County.
   d. Upon the discovery of multiple Native American human remains during a ground disturbing land development activity, the landowner may agree that additional conferral with descendents is necessary to consider culturally appropriate treatment of multiple Native American human remains. Culturally appropriate treatment of such a discovery may be ascertained from review of the site utilizing cultural and archaeological standards. Where the parties are unable to agree on the appropriate treatment measures the human remains and items associated and buried with Native American human remains shall be reinterred with appropriate dignity, pursuant to Section 5.c., above.

D. If Human Remains are NOT Native American
   1. The PI shall contact the Medical Examiner and notify them of the historic era context of the burial.
   2. The Medical Examiner will determine the appropriate course of action with the PI and City staff (PRC 5097.98).
   3. If the remains are of historic origin, they shall be appropriately removed and conveyed to the San Diego Museum of Man for analysis. The decision for internment of the human remains shall be made in consultation with MMC, EAS, the applicant/landowner, any known descendant group, and the San Diego Museum of Man.

V. Night and/or Weekend Work
A. If night and/or weekend work is included in the contract
   1. When night and/or weekend work is included in the contract package, the extent and timing shall be presented and discussed at the precon meeting.
   2. The following procedures shall be followed.
      a. No Discoveries
         In the event that no discoveries were encountered during night and/or weekend work, the PI shall record the information on the CSVR and submit to MMC via fax by 8AM of the next business day.
      b. Discoveries
         All discoveries shall be processed and documented using the existing procedures detailed in Sections III - During Construction, and IV - Discovery of Human Remains. Discovery of human remains shall always be treated as a significant discovery.
      c. Potentially Significant Discoveries
If the PI determines that a potentially significant discovery has been made, the procedures detailed under Section III - During Construction and IV - Discovery of Human Remains shall be followed.

d. The PI shall immediately contact MMC, or by 8AM of the next business day to report and discuss the findings as indicated in Section III-B, unless other specific arrangements have been made.

B. If night and/or weekend work becomes necessary during the course of construction
1. The Construction Manager shall notify the RE, or Bi, as appropriate, a minimum of 24 hours before the work is to begin.
2. The RE, or Bi, as appropriate, shall notify MMC immediately.

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

VI. Post Construction
A. Preparation and Submittal of Draft Monitoring Report
1. The PI shall submit two copies of the Draft Monitoring Report (even if negative), prepared in accordance with the Historical Resources Guidelines (Appendix C/D) which describes the results, analysis, and conclusions of all phases of the Archaeological Monitoring Program (with appropriate graphics) to MMC for review and approval within 90 days following the completion of monitoring. It should be noted that if the PI is unable to submit the Draft Monitoring Report within the allotted 90-day timeframe resulting from delays with analysis, special study results or other complex issues, a schedule shall be submitted to MMC establishing agreed due dates and the provision for submittal of monthly status reports until this measure can be met.
   a. For significant archaeological resources encountered during monitoring, the Archaeological Data Recovery Program shall be included in the Draft Monitoring Report.
   b. Recording Sites with State of California Department of Parks and Recreation
      The PI shall be responsible for recording (on the appropriate State of California Department of Park and Recreation forms-DPR 523 A/B) any significant or potentially significant resources encountered during the Archaeological Monitoring Program in accordance with the City's Historical Resources Guidelines, and submittal of such forms to the South Coastal Information Center with the Final Monitoring Report.
2. MMC shall return the Draft Monitoring Report to the PI for revision or, for preparation of the Final Report.
3. The PI shall submit revised Draft Monitoring Report to MMC for approval.
4. MMC shall provide written verification to the PI of the approved report.
5. MMC shall notify the RE or Bi, as appropriate, of receipt of all Draft Monitoring Report submittals and approvals.

B. Handling of Artifacts
1. The PI shall be responsible for ensuring that all cultural remains collected are cleaned and catalogued
2. The PI shall be responsible for ensuring that all artifacts are analyzed to identify function and chronology as they relate to the history of the area; that faunal material is identified as to species; and that specialty studies are completed, as appropriate.
3. The cost for curation is the responsibility of the property owner.
C. Curation of artifacts: Accession Agreement and Acceptance Verification
   1. The PI shall be responsible for ensuring that all artifacts associated with the survey, testing and/or data recovery for this project are permanently curated with an appropriate institution. This shall be completed in consultation with MMC and the Native American representative, as applicable.
   2. The PI shall include the Acceptance Verification from the curation institution in the Final Monitoring Report submitted to the RE or BI and MMC.
   3. When applicable to the situation, the PI shall include written verification from the Native American consultant/monitor indicating that Native American resources were treated in accordance with state law and/or applicable agreements. If the resources were reinterred, verification shall be provided to show what protective measures were taken to ensure no further disturbance occurs in accordance with Section IV – Discovery of Human Remains, Subsection 5.

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

NOISE

The applicant shall mitigate exterior noise impacts for the proposed project as follows:

I. Prior to Permit Issuance – Plan Check
   A. Prior to issuance of the Building permit, the Permit Holder shall incorporate the requirements for environmental noise mitigation on the appropriate construction documents as described in the (Traffic Noise Study – PTS 528826, RNS Acoustics, Ryan Sema, April 28, 2017) report.
   B. Prior to issuance of the building permit, the Assistant Deputy Director (ADD) Environmental designee shall verify the following sound attenuation measures have been incorporated into the design of the proposed development to reduce noise levels to below 60 dBA CNEL and interior areas below 45 dBA CNEL:

      1. Outdoor:
         A solid wooden fence of at least 6' in height shall be constructed with no air gaps between slats in order to achieve at CNEL level at 54 dBA. This fence shall be installed along western property line, parallel to Mission Blvd for the length of the property. This will ensure that the compatible limits for a residential use as listed in the Noise Element is not exceeded. Tongue and groove construction would provide an airtight seal, but other methods may be implemented as approved by the ADD.

      2. Indoor:
With the specifications as described above, wall and window types which meet the current edition of the California Building Code shall attenuate the CNEL noise level to below 45 dBA. Windows assemblies should be used throughout the home that have STC ratings at a minimum of 20. A mechanical ventilation system (Air Conditioning) shall be installed in order to prevent the need to have the windows open which may violate the indoor noise level requirements.

II. During Construction
A. Per Section §59.5.0404 “Construction Noise” of the San Diego Municipal Code, the Permit Holder shall comply with the following requirements for all phases of construction:

(a) It shall be unlawful for any person, between the hours of 7:00 p.m. of any day and 7:00 a.m. of the following day, or on legal holidays as specified in Section 21.04 of the San Diego Municipal Code, with exception of Columbus Day and Washington's Birthday, or on Sundays, to erect, construct, demolish, excavate for, alter or repair any building or structure in such a manner as to create disturbing, excessive or offensive noise unless a permit has been applied for and granted beforehand by the Noise Abatement and Control Administrator. In granting such permit, the Administrator shall consider whether the construction noise in the vicinity of the proposed work site would be less objectionable at night than during the daytime because of different population densities or different neighboring activities; whether obstruction and interference with traffic particularly on streets of major importance, would be less objectionable at night than during the daytime; whether the type of work to be performed emits noises at such a low level as to not cause significant disturbances in the vicinity of the work site; the character and nature of the neighborhood of the proposed work site; whether great economic hardship would occur if the work were spread over a longer time; whether proposed night work is in the general public interest; and he shall prescribe such conditions, working times, types of construction equipment to be used, and permissible noise levels as he deems to be required in the public interest.

(b) Except as provided in subsection C. hereof, it shall be unlawful for any person, including The City of San Diego, to conduct any construction activity so as to cause, at or beyond the property lines of any property zoned residential, an average sound level greater than 75 decibels during the 12-hour period from 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m.

(c) The provisions of subsection B. of this section shall not apply to construction equipment used in connection with emergency work, provided the Administrator is notified within 48 hours after commencement of work.

III. Post Construction – Prior to Final Inspection
A. The Permit Holder shall submit one copy of the final Acoustical Analysis with construction documents to the BI, and one copy to MMC.
B. In order to determine the effectiveness of the proposed mitigation measures, a noise assessment should be performed after construction is completed. This should be identical to the assessment outlined in this document regarding microphone position and type (CNEL). This will ensure that the property meets all applicable limits and regulations regarding noise.

C. MMC to verify the sound attenuation barrier has been constructed in accordance with the Construction documents.

The above mitigation monitoring and reporting program will require additional fees and/or deposits to be collected prior to the issuance of building permits, certificates of occupancy and/or final maps to ensure the successful completion of the monitoring program.

VI. PUBLIC REVIEW DISTRIBUTION:

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

CITY OF SAN DIEGO
Mayor’s Office
Councilmember - Lorie Zapf - District 2
City Attorney’s Office (59)
Facility Financing (93B)
Water Review (86A)

Development Services:
Development Project Manager – Pancho Mendoza
Senior Planner – Chris Tracy
Junior Planner – Rachael Lindquist
LDR - Engineering Review
LDR – Geology
LDR - Transportation
LDR – Landscaping
LDR - Planning Review
PUD - Sewer and Water
San Diego Central Library (81A)
Pacific Beach Library (81X)
Historic Resources Board (87)

OTHER ORGANIZATIONS AND INTERESTED PARTIES
The San Diego River Coalition (164)
Sierra Club San Diego Chapter (165)
San Diego Natural History Museum (166)
Environmental Health Coalition EHC (169)
San Diego Council of Divers Inc. (177)
EC Allison Research Center (181)
Vernal Pool Society (185)
Community Planners Committee (194)
Town Council Presidents Association (197)
RESULTS OF PUBLIC REVIEW:

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

( ) Comments addressing the accuracy or completeness of the draft environmental document were received during the public input period. The letters and responses are incorporated herein.

( X ) Comments were received but did not address the accuracy or completeness of the draft environmental document. No response is necessary and the letters are incorporated herein.

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 Entitlements Division for review, or for purchase at the cost of reproduction.

CHRISt TRACY, AICP
SENIOR PLANNER
Development Services Department

9/19/17
Date of Draft Report

10/16/17
Date of Final Report

Analyst: CHRIS TRACY, AICP, SENIOR PLANNER

Attachments: Responses to Draft MND
Location Map

Kramer CDP-SDP-TM/Project No. 528826       Address – 803 Law Street.
City of San Diego – Development Services Department
Site Plan
Kramer CDP-SDP-TM/Project No. 528826  Address – 803 Law Street.
City of San Diego – Development Services Department
A1. Comment noted. Archaeological and Native American Monitoring will be a required mitigation measure for this project.
September 25, 2017

Chris Trice
City of San Diego
Development Services Center
1222 First Avenue, MS 501
San Diego, CA 92101

Re: Kramer CDP/SDP/TM Project No. 528829

Dear Mr. Tracy:

This letter is written on behalf of the Rincon Band of Luiseño Indians. Thank you for inviting us to submit comments on the Kramer CDP/SDP/TM Project No. 528829. Rincon is submitting these comments concerning your project's potential impact on Luiseño cultural resources.

The Rincon Band has concerns for the impacts to historic and cultural resources and the finding of items of significant cultural value that could be disturbed or destroyed and are considered culturally significant to the Luiseño people. This is to inform you, your identified location is not within the Luiseño Aboriginal Territory. We recommend that you locate a tribe within the project area to receive direction on how to handle any inadvertent findings according to their customs and traditions.

If you would like information on tribes within your project area, please contact the Native American Heritage Commission and they will assist with a referral.

Thank you for the opportunity to protect and preserve our cultural assets.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Destiny Colacho
Manager
Rincon Cultural Resources Department

B1. Comment noted. Thank you for your input and recommendations.
C1. Per the City of San Diego’s (City) Historical Resources Guidelines (Guidelines), the applicant must provide verification that a qualified archaeologist and/or monitor has been retained to implement the Mitigation, Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) as identified in Section V of the Initial Study. Further, the City’s MMRP requires that a Native American Monitor be present during all ground disturbing activities associated with the project. The Native American Monitor also has specific responsibilities in the event of a discovery, including notifying the appropriate parties, assisting with determining the significance of the discovery, and isolating the discovery site. The City’s MMRP is adequately developed with sufficient measures that would substantially lessen or avoid significant environmental impacts associated with Historical Resources (Archaeology). The MMRP does not specifically state that the Native American monitor would be required to be Kumeyaay; however, the common practice in the City is to include Kumeyaay monitors on all projects requiring such mitigation measures.
INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

1. Project title/Project number: Kramer CDP/SDP/TM / 528826

2. Lead agency name and address: City of San Diego, 1222 First Avenue, MS-501, San Diego, California 92101

3. Contact person and phone number: Chris Tracy, AICP Senior Planner / (619) 446-5381

4. Project location: 803 Law Street, San Diego, CA 92109 (APN: 415-462-01-00)

5. Project Applicant/Sponsor's name and address: Helena Pellanada Shani Sparks, EOS Architecture Inc., 7542 Fay Avenue, San Diego, CA 92037

6. General/Community Plan designation: Multi-Family / Multi-Family - Pacific Beach Community Plan

7. Zoning: RM-1-1

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.):

   COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT, SITE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT, and TENTATIVE TRACT MAP (Process 3) for a Small Lot Subdivision to create two legal lots, and construct a second dwelling unit. The proposed project is located at southeast corner of Law Street and Mission Blvd. in Pacific Beach, CA. The existing single-family dwelling unit (located at 803 Law Street) proposes a remodel/addition encompassing 2,200 sq. ft. of livable area within a three-story configuration. The second, newly constructed single-family dwelling unit proposes to contain 2,811 sq. ft. of livable area within a two-story configuration. The subdivision elements of the project include the division of a 6,252 sq. ft. lot into two lots. Lot 1 encompasses 3,252 sq. ft. of area, and Lot 2 encompasses 3,000 sq. ft. of area. The proposed project is located in the RM-1-1 (Residential Multi-Family), Coastal Overlay Zone (Non-Appealable 2), Coastal Height Limitation Overlay Zone, Parking Impact Overlay Zone (PIOZ-Beach-Impact, PIOZ-Coastal-Impact), Residential Tandem Parking Overlay Zone, Transit Area Overlay Zone, Pacific Beach Local Coastal Program/Community Plan Area, and Council District 2.

9. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):
None required.

10. 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.

Yes, three Native American Tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area have requested consultation with the City of San Diego pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21082.3 (c). Consultation has concluded, and the tribes concurred with the recommendations to implement monitoring as proposed.

The project site is located in an urbanized and developed area where previous archaeological sites have not been recorded; however, it is located on the City of San Diego's Historical Resources Sensitivity map for resource potential. Furthermore, the project site is located within an area of Pacific Beach that requires special considerations due to the area's archaeological sensitivity with respect to the high potential for project grading to impact unknown prehistoric resources including human remains.

A California Historic Resources Information System (CHRIS) search was completed using the South Coastal Information Center (SCIC) digital database, concluding that the project site is located within a one mile radius of a known and recorded archaeological site with significant resource. The project's Limited Geotechnical Investigation (East County Soil Consultation & Engineering, Inc., 12/22/16) indicates that there are native soils (Alluvium) near the surface that would be disturbed by the proposed project. These soils have the potential to contain sensitive archaeological resources. With implementation of the historical resources monitoring program, potential impacts on historical resources would be reduced to less than significant.

Due to the number of resources within a 1-mile radius and the potential for unknown subsurface cultural resource deposits to occur within the project vicinity it was recommended that Archaeological and Native American monitors be present during grading activities. No additional mitigation concerning this issue area or further consultation under Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1 would be required.
ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

☐ Aesthetics  ☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions  ☐ Population/Housing

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

☐ Air Quality  ☐ Hydrology/Water Quality  ☐ Recreation

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

☒ Cultural Resources  ☐ Mineral Resources  ☒ Tribal Cultural Resources

☐ Geology/Soils  ☒ Noise  ☐ Utilities/Service System

☐ Mandatory Findings Significance

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

9) The explanation of each issue should identify:
   a. The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
   b. The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significant.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I) AESTHETICS – Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposed project is located within an “Intermediate Vista” on Mission Blvd. per Figure 16 and View Corridor on Law Street according to Figure 4 of the Pacific Beach Community and Local Coastal Plan.

Per “Public Access” Policy #13 of the Pacific Beach Community and Local Coastal Plan:

“Maintain and enhance the public views and scenic vistas of the beach and bay by undergrounding utilities and maintaining street landscaping, and by requiring new development to conform to the design standards of the commercial and residential elements of this plan. Figures 4, 16, and 18 of this plan shall be used together to determine where said design standards are to be applied.”

The project complies with this policy as there are no overhead utility lines on or adjacent to the project site, as such no impacts would result.

Per “Residential Land Use” Policy #8 of the Pacific Beach Community and Local Coastal Plan:

“The City shall ensure that new residential structures are designed to maintain public views of the beaches and bay.”

The project complies with this policy as it will meet all setback requirements for underlying zone, as such no impacts would result.

b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☑ |

The project is situated within a developed residential neighborhood. No such scenic resources inclusive of trees, rock outcroppings, historic buildings, or state scenic highways are located on, near, or adjacent to the project site. Therefore, no impacts would result.

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

See response to I(a). No impacts would result.
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Development of the residential project would comply with City glare regulations. All permanent exterior lighting would be required to comply with City regulations to reduce potential adverse effects on neighboring properties. In addition, no substantial sources of light would be generated during project construction, as construction activities would occur during daylight hours. The project would also be subject to the City's Outdoor Lighting Regulations per Municipal Code Section 142.0740. As such, impacts would be less than significant.

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

a) Converts Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

The project is consistent with the community plan's land use designation, and is located within a developed single and multi-family residential neighborhood. As such, the project site does not contain, and is not adjacent to, any lands identified as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as show on maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. Therefore, the project would not result in the conversion of such lands to non-agricultural use. No impacts would result.

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

Refer to response to II(a) above. There are no Williamson Act Contract lands on or within the vicinity of the project site. The project is consistent with the existing land use and the underlying zone. The project does not conflict with any agricultural use. 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 ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Refer to response to II(a) above. There are no Williamson Act Contract lands on or within the vicinity of the project site. The project is consistent with the existing land use and the underlying zone. The project does not conflict with any agricultural use. No impacts would result.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>defined by Public Resources Code section 4526, or timberland zoned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The project would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production. No designated forest land or timberland occur onsite as the project is consistent with the community plan, and the underlying zone. No impacts would result.

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

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

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

Refer to II(a) and II(c) 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 applicable air quality plan?

The San Diego Air Pollution Control District (SDAPCD) and San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) are responsible for developing and implementing the clean air plan for attainment and maintenance of the ambient air quality standards in the San Diego Air Basin (SDAB). The County Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) was initially adopted in 1991, and is updated on a triennial basis (most recently in 2009). The RAQS outlines the SDAPCD’s plans and control measures designed to attain the state air quality standards for ozone (03). The RAQS relies on information from the California Air Resources Board (CARB) and SANDAG, including mobile and area source emissions, as well as information regarding projected growth in San Diego County and the cities in the county, to project future emissions and then determine the strategies necessary for the reduction of emissions through regulatory controls. CARB mobile source emission projections and SANDAG growth projections are based on population, vehicle trends, and land use plans.
developed by San Diego County and the cities in the county as part of the development of their general plans.

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

The project proposes a remodel/addition to an existing single-family dwelling unit and construction of an additional single-family dwelling unit within a developed neighborhood of similar residential uses. The project is consistent with the General Plan, Community Plan, and the underlying zoning for residential development. Therefore, the project would be consistent at a sub-regional level with the underlying growth forecasts in the RAQS, and would not obstruct implementation of the RAQS. As such, impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

Short-term Emissions (Construction)

Project construction activities would potentially generate combustion emissions from on-site heavy duty construction vehicles and motor vehicles transporting the construction crew and necessary construction materials. Exhaust emissions generated by construction activities would generally result from the use of typical construction equipment that may include excavation equipment, forklift, skip loader, and/or dump truck. Variables that factor into the total construction emissions potentially generated include the level of activity, length of construction period, number of pieces and types of equipment in use, site characteristics, weather conditions, number of construction personnel, and the amount of materials to be transported on or off-site. It is anticipated that construction equipment would be used on-site for four to eight hours a day; however, construction would be short-term and impacts to neighboring uses would be minimal and temporary.

Fugitive dust emissions are generally associated with land clearing and grading operations. Due to the nature and location of the project, construction activities are expected to create minimal fugitive dust, as a result of the disturbance associated with grading. Construction operations would include standard measures as required by the City of San Diego grading permit to reduce potential air quality impacts to less than significant. Therefore, impacts associated with fugitive dust are considered less than significant, and would not violate an air quality standard or
contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. Impacts related to short term emissions would be less than significant.

Long-term Emissions (Operational)

Long-term air emission impacts are those associated with stationary sources and mobile sources related to any change caused by a project. The project would produce minimal stationary source emissions. Once construction of the project is complete, long-term air emissions would potentially result from such sources as fireplaces, heating, ventilation, and cooling (HVAC) systems, and other motorized equipment typically associated with residential uses. The project is compatible with the surrounding development and is permitted by the community plan and zone designation. Based on the residential land use, project emissions over the long-term are not anticipated to violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. Impacts would be less than significant.

Overall, the project is not expected to generate substantial emissions that would violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation; therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

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

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

Short-term (Construction)

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

**Long-term (Operational)**

Typical long-term operational characteristics of the project are not associated with the creation of such odors nor anticipated to generate odors affecting a substantial number of people. The project proposes a remodel/addition to an existing single-family dwelling unit and construction of an additional single-family dwelling unit. Residential dwelling units, in the long-term operation, are not typically associated with the creation of such odors nor are they anticipated to generate odors affecting a substantial number or people. Therefore, impacts 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 located in a developed urbanized setting within Pacific Beach. No Environmentally Sensitive Lands (ESL) are associated with the subject property, nor are adjacent to the site. 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 response IV(a) above. The project site is urban developed and currently supports non-native landscaping. Additionally, the project site is presently developed with an existing single-family residence and located within a residential neighborhood. The project site does not contain any riparian habitat or other identified community. No impacts would result.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Refer to response IV(a) above. The project site does not contain any federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. The project site is located within a developed residential neighborhood. No impacts would result.

d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

Refer to response IV(a) above. No formal and/or informal wildlife corridors are on or near the project site, as the project site is located within a developed residential neighborhood. Therefore, no impacts would result.

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

The project would not conflict with any local policies and/or ordinances protecting biological resources such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance. No impacts would result.

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?

Refer to response IV(e) above. The project site is located within a developed residential neighborhood and is not within, nor adjacent to, the City's Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA). Therefore, 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?

The purpose and intent of the Historical Resources Regulations of the Land Development Code (Chapter 14, Division 3, and Article 2) is to protect, preserve and, where damaged, restore the historical resources of San Diego. The regulations apply to all proposed development within the City of San Diego when historical resources are present on the premises. Before approving discretionary projects, CEQA requires the Lead Agency to identify and examine the significant adverse environmental effects which may result from that project. A project that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource may have a significant effect on the environment (Sections 15064.5(b) and 21084.1). A substantial adverse change is defined as demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration activities, which would impair historical
significance (Sections 15064.5(b)(1)). Any historical resource listed in, or eligible to be listed in the California Register of Historical Resources, including archaeological resources, is considered to be historically or culturally significant.

**Archaeological Resources**
The project site is located on the City of San Diego’s Historical Resources Sensitivity map. Furthermore, the project site is located within an area of Pacific Beach that requires special considerations due to the area’s archaeological sensitivity with respect to the high potential for project grading to impact unknown prehistoric resources including human remains.

A California Historic Resources Information System (CHRIS) search was completed using the South Coastal Information Center (SCIC) digital database, concluding that the project site is located within a one mile radius of a known and recorded archaeological site with significant resource. The project’s Limited Geotechnical Investigation (East County Soil Consultation & Engineering, Inc., 12/22/16) indicates that there are native soils (Alluvium) near the surface that would be disturbed by the proposed project. These soils have the potential to contain sensitive archaeological resources. With implementation of the historical resources monitoring program, potential impacts on historical resources would be reduced to less than significant.

**Built Environment**
The City of San Diego reviews projects requiring the demolition of structures 45 years or older for historic significance in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). CEQA Section 21084.1 states that “A project that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource is a project that may cause a significant effect on the environment.” Historic property (built environment) surveys are required for properties which are 45 years of age or older and which have integrity of setting, location, design, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association.

The property does not meet local designation criteria as an individually significant resource under any adopted Historical Resources Board Criteria. This determination is good for 5 years unless new information is provided that speaks to the building’s eligibility for designation. At this point, the building has no historic significance therefore, no impacts would result.

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5? [ ] ☒ ☐ ☐ ☐

Refer to response V(a) above. With implementation of the historical resources monitoring program, potential impacts on historical resources would be reduced to less than significant.

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

According to the "Geology of the San Diego Metropolitan Area, California, La Jolla, 7.5 Minute Quadrangle Maps" (Kennedy and Peterson, 1975), and the "Faulting and Bluff Geologic Evaluation
Report—Proposed Lusardi Residence” (CET, Inc., February 12, 2007), the project site is primarily underlain with alluvium slopewash and the highly sensitive Bay Point Formation.

According to the Grading and Drainage Plan, grading operations would entail approximately 350 cubic yards of cut with a maximum cut depth of three feet below existing grade.

As a guideline dependent on grading history, paleontological monitoring may be required if project grading meets or exceeds the City’s Thresholds of 1,000 cubic yards to 10 feet in depth in highly sensitive formations. This project falls below this threshold; therefore, the project does not have the potential to disturb or destroy paleontological resources and therefore, does not exceed the threshold for paleontological monitoring. No impacts would result.

d) Disturb human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries? □ ☒ ☐ ☐

Refer to response V(a) above. This site does have the potential to encounter archaeological resources which could include cultural resources such as human remains. With implementation of the historical resources monitoring program, potential impacts on historical resources would be reduced to less than significant.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS – Would the project:

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

i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. □ ☐ ☒ ☐

The project is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Fault Zone. The project would be required to comply with seismic requirement of the California Building Code, utilize proper engineering design and utilization of standard construction practices, to be verified at the building permit stage. Impacts would be less than significant.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? □ ☐ ☒ ☐

The site could be affected by seismic activity as a result of earthquakes on major active faults located throughout the Southern California area. The project would utilize proper engineering design and utilization of standard construction practices, to be verified at the building permit stage. Impacts would be less than significant.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? □ ☐ ☒ ☐
Liquefaction occurs when loose, unconsolidated, water-laden soils are subject to shaking, causing the soils to lose cohesion. Implementation of the project would not result in an increase in the potential for seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction. The project would utilize proper engineering design and utilization of standard construction practices, to be verified at the building permit stage. Impacts would be less than significant.

iv) Landslides? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

The City of San Diego Seismic Safety Study Maps (1995 Edition, Map 25) have designated the geology at the project location as being within the City of San Diego Geologic Hazard Categories 52 (low risk of landslides). The project would utilize proper engineering design and utilization of standard construction practices, to be verified at the building permit stage. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

Construction of the project would temporarily disturb onsite soils during grading activities, thereby increasing the potential for soil erosion to occur; however, the use of standard erosion control measures during construction would reduce the potential for soil erosion or 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 off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

See Section (IV)(a)(iv). Impact would be less than significant.

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

See Section (IV)(a)(iv). Impact 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? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

This project does not propose such structures, therefore no impacts would result.
VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS – Would the project:

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

The City’s Climate Action Plan (CAP) outlines the actions that the City will undertake to achieve its proportional share of State greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reductions. A 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 emission targets identified in the CAP are achieved. The project is consistent with the General Plan and Community Plan land use and zoning designations with allowable deviations. Further based upon review and evaluation of the completed CAP Consistency Checklist, the project is consistent with the applicable strategies and actions of the CAP.

Based on the project’s consistency with the City’s CAP Checklist, the project’s contribution of GHG’s to cumulative and direct statewide emissions would be less than cumulatively considerable. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

The project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purposes of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases. The project is consistent with the existing General Plan and Community Plan land use and zoning designations. Further based upon review and evaluation of the completed CAP Consistency Checklist for the project, the project is consistent with the applicable strategies and actions of the CAP. Therefore, the project is consistent with the assumptions for relevant CAP strategies toward achieving the identified GHG reduction targets. Impacts would be less than significant.

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Would the project:

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

The project proposes a remodel/addition to an existing single-family dwelling unit and construction of an additional single-family dwelling unit. Although minimal amounts of such substances may be present during construction, they are not anticipated to create a significant public hazard. Once constructed, due to the nature of the project, the routine transport, use, or
disposal of hazardous materials on or through the subject site is not anticipated. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

Refer to response VIII(a) above. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

Refer to responses VIII(a) above. The project site is not within one quarter mile of a school. Future risk of releases of hazardous substances would not occur as a result of project operations because it is anticipated that future on-site operations would not require the routine use or transport of acutely hazardous materials. Construction of the project may require the use of hazardous materials (fuels, lubricants, solvents, etc.), which would require proper storage, handling, use and disposal. Further, the project would be required to comply with all federal, state and local requirements associated with hazardous materials; therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

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?

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

A hazardous waste site record search was completed in September 2017 using GeoTracker, an online website which discloses any type of hazardous clean-up site:
http://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/

The records search showed that no hazardous waste sites exist onsite or in the surrounding area. No Impacts would result.

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

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

hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

The proposed project is not located within an airport land use plan, or two miles of a public airport or public use airport. No impacts would result.

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

The proposed project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip, or would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area. No impacts would result.

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

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

h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

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

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY - Would the project:

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

The project would comply with all storm water quality standards during and after construction, and appropriate Best Management Practices (BMP's) must be utilized. Implementation of these BMP's would preclude any violations of existing standards and discharge regulations. This will be addressed through the project's Conditions of Approval; therefore, impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The project does not require the construction of wells. The project is located within a developed residential neighborhood with existing public water supply infrastructure. This issue was reviewed by Public Utilities in terms of water availability for the project and existing infrastructure was found to be sufficient for proposal. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

| ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

The project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or the area. Streams or rivers do not occur on or adjacent to the site. Although grading is proposed, the project would implement on-site BMPs, therefore ensuring that substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site would not occur. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

| ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

The project would implement low impact development principles ensuring that a substantial increase in the rate or amount of surface runoff resulting in flooding on or off-site, or a substantial alteration to the existing drainage pattern would not occur. Streams or rivers do not occur on or adjacent to the project site. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

| ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
Refer to Section IX(a) for additional discussion. The project would comply with all City storm water quality standards during and after construction. Appropriate BMP’s would be implemented to ensure that water quality is not degraded; therefore, ensuring that the project runoff is directed to appropriate onsite drainage systems. Due to the nature of the project, any runoff from the site is not anticipated to exceed the capacity of existing storm water systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff that would require new or expanded facilities. Impacts would be less than significant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The project would comply with all City storm water quality standards during and after construction. Appropriate BMP’s would be implemented to ensure that water quality is not degraded. Impacts would be less than significant.

| g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map? |                               |                                                   | ○                           | ○         |
|                                                                                                                                  |                               |                                                   | ○                           | ○         |
|                                                                                                                                  |                               |                                                   | ○                           | ○         |
|                                                                                                                                  |                               |                                                   | ○                           | ○         |

The project site is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area or any other known flood area. No impacts would result.

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

Refer to Response IX(g). No impacts would result.

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING – Would the project:

| a) Physically divide an established community? |                               |                                                   | ○                           | ○         |
|                                                                                                                                  |                               |                                                   | ○                           | ○         |
|                                                                                                                                  |                               |                                                   | ○                           | ○         |
|                                                                                                                                  |                               |                                                   | ○                           | ○         |

The proposed project would be consistent with the General Plan land use designation and Pacific Beach Community Plan land use designation of Multi-Family Density Residential (9-14 dwelling units per acre). The project site is located within a developed neighborhood that is surrounded by existing residential development and the site contains an existing home. As designed, the project would not physically divide an established community. No impacts would result.

| b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including but not limited to the |                               |                                                   | ○                           | ○         |
|                                                                                                                                  |                               |                                                   | ○                           | ○         |
|                                                                                                                                  |                               |                                                   | ○                           | ○         |
|                                                                                                                                  |                               |                                                   | ○                           | ○         |
The project site would not conflict with a habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan as it is located within an urbanized infill site. The project is compatible with the area designated for residential development by the General Plan and Community Plan, and is consistent with the existing underlying zone and surrounding land uses. Furthermore, the project would not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including but not limited to the general plan, community plan, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. No impacts would result.

XI. MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the project?

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

There are no known mineral resources located on the proposed project site. The City of San Diego General Plan (Figure CE-6) designates the project site and the surrounding area as Mineral Resource Zone 3 (MRZ-3). MRZ-3 areas are classified as areas containing mineral deposits, the significance of which cannot be evaluated from available data. There are no known mineral resources located on or adjacent to the project site. The urbanized and developed nature of the site and vicinity would preclude the extraction of any such resources. No impacts would result.

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

See response XI(a) above. The project site has not been delineated on a local general 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. No impacts would result.

XII. NOISE – Would the project result in:

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Refer to Response X(a). No impacts would result.
An Acoustical Analysis Report was prepared by RNS Acoustics, April 28, 2017 that analyzed potential noise impacts associated with exterior and interior noise from traffic. The assessment was performed to determine the Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) on traffic on the west side of the property along Mission Blvd, which has an Average Daily Traffic (ADT) of 10,900 in 2013 and is forecast to be 10,700 in 2035. In the General Plan Noise Element of the City of San Diego, it indicates that traffic noise may exceed 65 dBA limit for exterior traffic noise for those ADT values. Noise from construction and traffic could result in impacts that would affect future residents.

**Construction Noise**

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

For the long-term, typical noise levels associated with residential uses are anticipated, and the project would not result in an increase in the existing ambient noise level. The project would not result in noise levels in excess of standards established in the City of San Diego General Plan or Noise Ordinance. No significant long-term impacts would occur, and no mitigation measures are required.

**Operational Noise**

The 24-hour CNEL measured inside of the existing fence of the property in the useable outdoor space recording 62.8 dBA which exceeds the limits in Table NE-3 of the Noise Element of Compatibility of 60 dBA for exterior noise and 45 dBA for interior noise.

The acoustical analysis recommends mitigation of a six foot solid wood fence to mitigate for these noise levels and outlines what the traffic noise levels would reduce to for exterior and interior noise levels as identified in Table 2 of the Traffic Noise Study (Sema, 2017). With the implementation of required mitigation measures, exterior noise level would reduce to below a
level of significance at 54 dBA and interior noise would be reduced to 28.2 dBA. The Acoustical Analysis recommends a final noise assessment, which would be performed post construction. Implementation of these mitigation measures, as described, would reduce noise impacts to below a level of significance.

b) Generation of, excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?

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

Potential effects from construction noise would be reduced through compliance with City requirements. Pile driving activities that would potentially result in ground borne vibration or ground borne noise are not anticipated with construction of the project. No impacts would result.

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

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

The project would not significantly increase long-term (ambient) noise levels. The project would not introduce a new land use or significantly increase the intensity of the allowed land use. Post-construction noise levels and traffic would be generally unchanged as compared to noise with the existing residential use. 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?

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The project site is not located within an airport land use plan. The project site is also not located within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. No impacts would result.

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?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated ☐ Less Than Significant Impact ☒ No Impact

The project site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. No impacts would result, and no mitigation measures are required.

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING – Would the project:

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated ☐ Less Than Significant Impact ☒ No Impact

The project site is located in a developed residential neighborhood, and is surrounded by similar residential development. The project site currently receives water and sewer service from the City, and no extension of infrastructure to new areas is required. As such, the project would not substantially increase housing or population growth in the area. No roadway improvements are proposed as part of the project. No impacts would result.

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated ☐ Less Than Significant Impact ☒ No Impact

The project proposes a remodel/addition to an existing single-family dwelling unit and construction of an additional single-family dwelling unit. However, the proposal does not necessitate the extension of existing roads or other infrastructure. No impacts would occur.

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated ☐ Less Than Significant Impact ☒ No Impact

See response XIII(b) above. The project would not displace housing or require the replacement housing elsewhere, but would in fact add to the housing inventory. No impacts would result.

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES

a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provisions of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service rations, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Fire Protection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The City of San Diego Fire-Rescue Department (SDFD) encompasses all fire, emergency medical, lifeguard and emergency management services. SDFD serves 331 square miles, including the project site, and serves a population of 1,337,000. SDFD has 801 uniformed fire personnel and 48 fire stations available to service the project site. The closest fire station to the project site is Station 21 (approximately .7 miles south). The project proposes a remodel/addition to an existing single-family dwelling unit and construction of an additional single-family dwelling unit. Construction of the project is not anticipated to result in a significant increase in demand for Fire Protection services. Any impacts would be less than significant.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Police Protection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The City of San Diego Police Department (SDPD) would serve the proposed project. The project site is located within the SDPD's Northern Division, which serves a population of 225,234 people and encompasses 41.3 square miles. The project proposes a remodel/addition to an existing single-family dwelling unit and construction of an additional single-family dwelling unit would not require any new or altered police protection services. The project proposes a remodel/addition to an existing single-family dwelling unit and construction of an additional single-family dwelling unit. Construction of the project is not anticipated to result in a significant increase in demand for Police Services. Any impacts would be less than significant.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The project site is located in an urbanized and developed area where public school services are available. The project would not significantly increase the demand on public schools over that which currently exists. Construction of the project is not anticipated to result in a significant increase in demand for public educational services. Any impacts would be less than significant.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v) Parks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The project site is located in an urbanized and developed area where City-operated parks are available. The nearest park to the project site is Palisades Park, 0.2 miles to the west. The project would not significantly increase the demand on existing neighborhood or regional parks, or other recreational facilities, over that which presently exists. Construction of the project is not anticipated to result in a significant increase in demand for parks or other offsite recreational facilities. Any impacts would be less than significant.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi) Other public facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The project site is located in an urbanized and developed area where City services are already available. Any impacts would be less than significant.

XV. RECREATION

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

The project would remodel the existing structure and construct an additional home on the property, and therefore, not significantly affecting the availability of and/or need for new or expanded recreational resources.

The project would not adversely affect existing levels of public services, and would not require the construction or expansion of an existing governmental facility. The project would not significantly increase the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities. Therefore, the project is not anticipated to result in the use of available parks or facilities such that substantial deterioration occurs, or that would require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities to satisfy demand under the scope of this project. As such, no significant impacts related to recreational facilities have been identified. Any impacts would be less than significant.

b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

See response to XIV(a) above. The project does not propose recreation facilities, nor does it require the construction or expansion of any such facilities. Any impacts would be less than significant.

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC – Would the project?

a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and

See response to XIV(a) above. The project does not propose recreation facilities, nor does it require the construction or expansion of any such facilities. Any impacts would be less than significant.
potentially significant impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potential for significant impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

rnways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?

Construction of the project would not change existing circulation patterns on area roadways; however, a temporary minor increase in traffic may occur during construction. The project would not conflict with any applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system. The project is not expected to cause a significant short term or long-term increase in traffic volumes, and thus, would not adversely affect existing levels of service along area roadways. Any impacts would be less than significant.

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

Refer to response XVI(a) above. Construction of the project would not generate significant additional vehicular traffic nor would it significantly affect any mode of transportation in the area. Any impacts would be less than significant.

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

The project would not result in a change to air traffic patterns in that the structures would be less than 30 feet in height, due to height restrictions within the Coastal Zone. Therefore, the project would not create a safety risk. The project site is not located within any Airport Overlay Zones or is located near any private airstrips. No impacts would result.

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

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

e) Result in inadequate emergency access? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

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

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

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

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

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

Refer to Section V(a). No features at the site were deemed eligible for listing in any historic register. However, there is a potential that there are buried historical resources at the project site and these resources would meet the definition of tribal cultural resources. The requirement to include monitoring will be included as a mitigation requirement within the MMRP. The MMRP is listed in Section V of the MND and would reduce impacts to archaeological resources and Tribal Cultural Resources to below a level of CEQA significance.

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 ☐ ☒ ☐ ☐
Refer to response V(a) above. The project site is located in an urbanized and developed area where previous archaeological sites have not been recorded; however, it is located on the City of San Diego's Historical Resources Sensitivity map for resource potential. Furthermore, the project site is located within an area of Pacific Beach that requires special considerations due to the area's archaeological sensitivity with respect to the high potential for project grading to impact unknown prehistoric resources including human remains. Therefore, mitigation measures related to cultural resources (archaeology) are required.

XVIII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:

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

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Implementation of the project would not interrupt existing sewer service to the project site or other surrounding uses. No increase in demand for wastewater disposal or treatment would be created by the project, as compared to current conditions. The additional proposed residential unit is not anticipated to generate significant amounts of wastewater. Wastewater facilities used by the project would be operated in accordance with the applicable wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). Additionally, the project site is located in an urbanized and developed area. Adequate services are already available to serve the project. 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?

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

See response XVII (a) above. Adequate services are available to serve the project site. Additionally, the proposed project would not significantly increase the demand for water or wastewater treatment services and thus, would not trigger the need for new treatment facilities. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

The project would not exceed the capacity of the existing storm water drainage systems and therefore, would not require construction of new or expansion of existing storm water drainage facilities of which could cause significant environmental effects. The project was reviewed by
qualified City staff who determined that the existing facilities are adequately sized to accommodate the proposed development. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

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

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

f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?  □ ☐ ☒ ☐ ☐

Construction debris and waste would be generated from the remodel of the existing residence and the construction of an additional residence. All construction waste from the project site would be transported to an appropriate facility, which would have adequate capacity to accept the limited amount of waste that would be generated by the project.

Long-term operation of the proposed residential units are anticipated to generate typical amounts of solid waste associated with a residential use. Furthermore, the project would be required to comply with the City’s Municipal Code for diversion of both construction waste during the demolition phase and solid waste during the long-term, operational phase. Impacts are considered to be less than significant.

g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulation related to solid waste?  □ ☐ ☒ ☐ ☐

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

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

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?

☐ ☒ ☐ ☐

The proposed project involves remodeling and expansion of an existing single-family residential structure and the development of an additional single-family residence at the project site. The project site is designated for residential development. The site is surrounded by established residential neighborhoods. This analysis has determined that there is the potential of significant impacts related to Cultural Resources (Archaeology), Noise and Tribal Cultural Resources. As such, mitigation measures included in this document would reduce these potential impacts to a less than significant level as outlined within the Mitigated Negative Declaration.

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)?

☐ ☒ ☐ ☐

As documented in this Initial Study, the project may have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, notably with respect to Historical Resources (Archaeology), Noise, and Tribal Cultural Resources, which may have cumulatively considerable impacts. As such, mitigation measures have been incorporated to reduce impacts to less than significant. Other future projects within the surrounding neighborhood or community would be required to comply with applicable local, State, and Federal regulations to reduce the potential impacts to less than significant, or to the extent possible. As such, the project is not anticipated to contribute potentially significant cumulative environmental impacts.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c) Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposed project involves remodeling and expansion of an existing single-family residential structure and the development of an additional single-family residence at the project site. The project is consistent with the environmental setting and with the use as anticipated by the City. It is not anticipated that demolition or construction activities would create conditions that would significantly directly or indirectly impact human beings. Impacts would be less than significant.
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