

INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

1. Project title/Project number: N. University Fire Station No. 50 SDP / 463835
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, Associate Planner / (619) 446-5381
4. Project location: 7544 ½ Toscana Drive (Temporary Address), SE Corner of Noble Drive and Shoreline Drive (APN: 345-011-24-00), San Diego, CA 92122
5. Project Applicant/Sponsor's name and address: Safdie Rabines c/o City of San Diego, 923 Fort Stockton Drive, San Diego, CA 92103
6. General/Community Plan designation: Residential/University Community Plan - Central Subarea – Residential Category #3 (15- 30 dwelling units per acre).
7. Zoning: RS 1-14 (Residential Single-Family)
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.):

SITE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT (CIP-2) [and MSCP Multi-Habitat Planning Area \(MHPA\) Boundary Line Adjustment](#) for the development of a new three story 16,077 sq. ft. fire Station within ESL (Environmentally Sensitive Lands). The project site is located in the University City Community Plan area within the City of San Diego. The site is west of Interstate 805 and sites adjacent to the southeast corner of Nobel Drive and Shoreline Drive on City owned land. The project is located within the RS-1-14 Zone, MHPA (Multi-Habitat Planning Area), FAA (Federal Aeronautical Aviation) Part 77 Miramar, Brush Management Zones 1 and 2, Transit Area Overlay and is located within Council District 1. The development footprint of the project would comprise of [0.94](#) [0.912](#) acre. The three-story fire station would accommodate 10 personnel and equipment in order to provide improved emergency response times that meets national standards within the North University City area. The site contains sensitive biological resources as defined under the City's ESL regulations. The project site is located on an undeveloped area currently served by existing public services and utilities. The site is not

included on any Government Code listing of hazardous waste sites. (LEGAL DESCRIPTION: A Portion of Pueblo Lot 1304 of the Pueblo Lands of San Diego, in the City of San Diego, County of San Diego, State of California, According to map thereof made by James Pascoe in 1870, A Copy of which map was filed in the office of San Diego County Recorder, November 14, 1921 and Misc. Map No 36)

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, two 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 as proposed. The project is located in an undeveloped area and a cultural survey was conducted and it was determined that previous archaeological sites have not been recorded at the project site. No resources were identified during the survey at the site; however, there are a number of resources within a 1-mile radius and therefore there is potential for unknown subsurface cultural resource deposits to occur in the undisturbed area. Because the project requires extensive grading within an area that has not been significantly disturbed it was recommended that archaeological and Native American monitors 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.

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

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

I) AESTHETICS – Would the project:

- a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

No designated public and/or scenic corridors per the University Community Plan exist on the site. Therefore, the project would not result in a substantial adverse effect. Furthermore the project will incorporate a natural earth-tone color palette, be placed in a depressed graded area below the adjacent street grade, and provide on-site landscaping features which will help provide a visual transition from the adjacent natural open space and sensitive resource area as it relates to the project site. As such, any impacts would be less than significant.

- 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 and adjacent open-space area. No identified scenic resources such as trees, rock outcroppings, historic buildings and 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? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

The site is currently vacant and is surrounded by existing development to the north, south, and west. Construction of the fire station would be compatible is permitted by the community plan and zoning designation and would not substantially degrade the existing visual character of the neighborhood in a general sense. Furthermore the project will incorporate a natural earth-tone color palette, be placed in a depressed graded area below the adjacent street grade, and provide on-site landscaping features in the rear (native landscaping), which will help provide a visual transition from the adjacent natural open space and sensitive resource area. Therefore, any impacts would be less than significant.

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

Development of the residential project would comply with City glare regulations. All permanent exterior lighting would be required to comply with City and Land Use Agency 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, any impacts would be less than significant.

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

II. AGRICULTURAL AND FOREST RESOURCES: In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of 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 located within a vacant open-space parcel and is surrounded by residential and open-space uses. The project site does not contain, and is not adjacent to, any lands identified as Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as show on maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resource Agency. Therefore, the project would not result in the conversion of such lands to non-agricultural use. No significant impacts would occur, and no mitigation measures are required.

- 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 defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?

☐
☐
☐
☒

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

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

☐
☐
☐
☒

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

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 residential or designated open-space areas containing native grasslands. 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?

☐
☐
☐
☒

No Impact, Refer to II (a) and (c) above.

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

- a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

☐
☐
☒
☐

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

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

The project encompasses the construction of fire station with 10 personal per shift. The project is consistent with the General Plan, University Community Plan, and the underlying Zoning designation 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, any impacts would be less than significant.

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No impact
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Short-term 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 heating, ventilation, and cooling (HVAC) systems, and other motorized equipment typically associated with a fire station with living quarters. 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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No impact
(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 operation of a Fire Station, nor anticipated to generate odors affecting a substantial number of people.

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 following is a discussion concerning species as it relates to 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:

Direct Impacts:

Sensitive Vegetation Communities

Per the North University Fire Station 50 Project Biological Survey Report, "The proposed project would result in permanent impacts to a total of 0.94 acre, including 0.79 acre inside the MHPA (0.02 of which occurs within the Mitigation Parcel) and 0.26 acre outside the MHPA (Table 3 and Figure 8). BMZ 2, which is considered impact-neutral, extends beyond the grading footprint to the south and would occur on 0.30 acre, including 0.25 acre inside the MHPA (including 0.21 acre

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

within the Mitigation Parcel) and 0.05 acre outside the MHPA (see Table 3 and Figure 8). The City Fire Department would be responsible for maintaining BMZ 2 on a regular basis through weed and invasive species control, and selective thinning and pruning of shrubs to reduce fuel load.

Valley needlegrass grassland, Diegan coastal sage scrub, and non-native grassland are considered sensitive vegetation communities pursuant to the City's Biology Guidelines. The project would result in direct impacts to 0.50 acre of sensitive vegetation communities.

Therefore, impacts to 0.12 acre of valley needlegrass grassland, 0.24 acre of Diegan coastal sage scrub (including disturbed), and 0.14 acre of non-native grassland would be considered significant and mitigation would be required. Impacts to disturbed land, ornamental plantings, and urban/developed lands would be less than significant as these are not considered sensitive by the City or other resource agencies. Per the City's Significance Determination Thresholds, impacts to valley needlegrass grassland would be considered a significant cumulative impact and would require additional mitigation.

BMZ 2 would extend in several areas beyond the grading footprint and into undeveloped areas. Most of this area lies within existing ornamental vegetation (0.16 acre, including 0.14 acre within the MHPA). However, a portion of the BMZ 2 area would intersect Tiers 1 through IIIB vegetation, including 0.03 acre of valley needlegrass grassland (all within the MHPA including 0.02 acre within the Mitigation Parcel), 0.08 acre of Diegan coastal sage scrub (all within the MHPA including 0.03 acre within the Mitigation Parcel), and 0.04 acre of non-native grassland (all within the MHPA including 0.03 acre within the Mitigation Parcel). Pursuant to the City's Biology Guidelines, effects from BMZ 2 outside the grading footprint are considered impact neutral and would not require mitigation." (Biological Survey Report for the North University Fire Station 50 Project, 2017)

Sensitive Animals

Per the Biological Survey Report, Page 32, "Belding's orange-throated whiptail was observed during surveys and is considered present throughout the Diegan coastal sage scrub, valley needlegrass grassland, and nonnative grassland within the project site. Thus, a total of 0.50 acre of occupied Belding's orange-throated whiptail habitat would be directly impacted (including 0.42 acre within the MHPA and 0.08 acre outside the MHPA). Impacts to Belding's orange-throated whiptail would be considered significant and would require mitigation.

The MSCP conditions for coverage for Belding's orange-throated whiptail require development projects to address edge effects. Unauthorized trails and other signs of frequent human recreational access were present throughout the undeveloped areas within and surrounding the survey area, including within the MHPA. Furthermore, as the site is located along a busy road and across the street from an athletic field, there is currently no barrier to such access. As a fire station with a relatively low level of public access, the proposed project would not increase unauthorized human access into the MHPA, and would include landscaping and other facilities that would deter further access from the fire station itself.

Red diamond rattlesnake is a CDFW species of special concern. It was determined to have moderate potential to occur in Diegan coastal sage scrub, valley needlegrass grassland, and non-native grassland within the project site and survey area. Therefore, potential direct impacts to this

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

species would total of 0.50 acre (including 0.42 acre within the MHPA and 0.08 acre outside the MHPA). This direct impact to suitable red diamond rattlesnake habitat would be considered significant and would require mitigation.

Coast horned lizard is a CDFW species of special concern and an MSCP-covered species. It was not detected within the survey area; however, it was determined to have moderate potential to occur within the coastal sage scrub in the survey area. Therefore potential direct impacts to this species would total 0.24 acre (including 0.19 acre within the MHPA and 0.05 acre outside the MHPA). This direct impact to suitable coast horned lizard habitat would be considered significant and would require mitigation.

The MSCP conditions for coverage for coast horned lizard require projects to include specific measures to maintain native ant species, discourage the Argentine ant (*Linepithema humile*), and protect against detrimental edge effects to this species. Argentine ants were detected on-site within Diegan coastal sage scrub and urban/developed land (see Attachment 2), and their presence will continue to be supported by irrigation associated with the large multi-family residential developments and the athletic field in the area. Even so, project landscaping will consist of native species, which are drought-tolerant and require less irrigation than typical landscaping plants. All container plant stock will be required to be inspected by the project biologist (preferably off-site prior to shipment to the site). The biologist shall reject any plants that show evidence of non-native ants.

Coastal California gnatcatcher was not detected during protocol gnatcatcher surveys conducted in 2015; however, it has moderate potential to occur within the project site. Potential impacts to this species, if present, would be considered significant and would require mitigation.

The MSCP conditions for coverage for the coastal California gnatcatcher require measures to reduce edge effects and minimize disturbance during the nesting period, fire protection measures to reduce the potential for habitat degradation due to unplanned fire, and management measures to maintain or improve habitat quality indulging vegetation structure. No clearing of occupied habitat within the City's MHPAs and within the County's Biological Resource Core Areas may occur between March 1 and August 15. As mentioned above, the proposed project is not expected increase unauthorized human access into the MHPA, and would include landscaping and other facilities that would deter further access from the fire station itself.

Southern California rufous-crowned sparrow was not detected within the project site during directed searches in 2015. Nonetheless, it has moderate potential to occur in the project site. Impacts to this species would be considered significant and would require mitigation.

The MSCP conditions for coverage of southern California rufous-crowned sparrow include maintenance of dynamic processes, such as fire, to perpetuate some open phases of coastal sage scrub with herbaceous components. As mentioned above, the proposed project is not expected increase unauthorized human access into the MHPA, and would include landscaping and other facilities that would deter further access from the fire station itself.

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

Cooper's hawk is a CDFW Watch List species and is an MSCP-covered species. It has no potential to nest within the survey area; however, due to the presence of potential nesting trees in Rose Canyon to the south and at the athletic fields to the north, it has high potential to forage in the project site and survey area. Because no nesting is expected, no direct impacts to Cooper's hawk would occur.

The MSCP conditions for coverage for Cooper's hawk include a 300-foot impact avoidance area around active nests, and minimization of disturbance in oak woodlands and oak riparian forests. As discussed in Section 5.4.2, Cooper's hawks have high potential to occur in trees along Rose Creek approximately 750 feet south of the project site. These trees are relatively far from the project site and separated by an existing apartment complex. As a result, any Cooper's hawks or other raptors nesting in these trees would not be impacted by the project. Cooper's hawks have low potential to occur in the landscaping trees within 300 feet of the project site, as these are situated adjacent to an active athletic field along a busy roadway. Thus, project construction is not expected to affect Cooper's hawks or other nesting raptors.

Western bluebird was observed in the vicinity of the athletic fields over 100 feet from the project site. No suitable habitat for this species occurs within the project site. Therefore no significant impact to western bluebird would occur.

San Diego black-tailed jackrabbit was not detected during surveys; however, this species was determined to have moderate potential to occur in the valley needlegrass grassland, Diegan coastal sage scrub, and non-native grassland within the survey area. Therefore, potential direct impacts to this species would total of 0.50 acre (including 0.42 acre within the MHPA and 0.08 acre outside the MHPA). Impacts to San Diego black-tailed jackrabbit would be considered significant and would require mitigation.

San Diego desert woodrat was determined to have low potential to nest but moderate potential to forage in the survey area. Such foraging would likely occur in the valley needlegrass grassland, Diegan coastal sage scrub, and non-native grassland within the survey area. Woodrats would be expected to be in their middens (which were not found in the project site and would not be directly impacted) during the day, and any active foraging woodrats would be expected to retreat to the middens during clearing, grading, and grubbing. Thus, San Diego desert woodrat would not be directly impacted by the proposed project, but 0.50 acre (including 0.42 acre within the MHPA and 0.08 acre outside the MHPA) of suitable foraging habitat be impacted. Impacts to San Diego desert woodrat foraging habitat would be considered significant and would require mitigation.

6.1.5.2 General Wildlife

Direct impacts are anticipated to occur to small burrowing mammals and reptiles during grading of the project site. Such species have low mobility and may be expected to retreat to burrows within the grading footprint during construction. Any birds that are not nesting are highly mobile and are expected to avoid being impacted. Impacts to general wildlife are, therefore, considered less than significant and would not require mitigation.

6.1.5.3 Nesting Birds

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

The proposed project has potential to directly impact nesting and migratory birds nesting covered by the MBTA during vegetation clearing. Species covered by the MBTA that may potentially nest in the project area include (but are not limited to) common sage scrub species such as black phoebe (*Sayornis nigricans semiatra*), western scrub-jay (*Aphelocoma californica*), bushtit (*Psaltiriparus minimus minimus*), wrentit (*Chamaea fasciata henshawi*), and California towhee (*Pipilo crissalis*). Direct impacts to nesting migratory birds would be considered significant and require mitigation.”

Indirect Impacts:

Sensitive Animals

Per the North University Fire Station 50 Project Biological Survey Report, Page 32,

“6.2.1 Indirect Impacts to Nesting Birds, The proposed project has potential to cause indirect impacts to nesting birds, including Cooper’s hawk (which may nest in large trees to the north of the project site) and migratory bird species within Diegan coastal sage scrub and grassland habitats within the MHPA adjacent to the project site. Such potential indirect impacts could occur due to dust or noise levels generated during project construction and vegetation removal. Impacts to Cooper’s hawk and migratory or nesting birds would be considered significant and require mitigation, including biological monitoring and avoidance of typical nesting periods. Further details are outlined in the Mitigation section (Section 7.0). Protocol coastal California gnatcatcher surveys conducted in 2015 were negative. However, there is suitable habitat within 300 feet of the project site. Therefore there is a moderate potential for this species to be indirectly impacted due to the proposed project. Indirect impacts to coastal California gnatcatcher would be considered significant and would require mitigation.

6.2.2 MHPA

In addition to direct impacts to biological resources both outside and inside the MHPA, the project has potential to cause indirect impacts to biological resources in the MHPA along the eastern and southern boundaries. As stated in the MSCP Section 1.4.3 (City of San Diego 1997), land uses adjacent to the MHPA are to be managed to ensure minimal impacts to the MHPA. The MSCP establishes adjacency guidelines to be addressed on a project by project basis to minimize direct and indirect impacts and maintain the function of the MHPA. A discussion of project actions to reduce impacts within the MHPA is presented in Section 6.4, and Land Use Adjacency Guidelines are specifically addressed in Section 6.4.3.

6.2.3 Applicable Area Specific Management Directives

The MSCP identifies general and specific management directives, which are intended to preclude impacts, particularly those related to urban edge effects which include (but are not limited to) trampling, dumping, vehicular traffic, competition with invasive species (i.e., parasitism or predation from invasive animal species and habitat degradation from introduction of non-native plant species), predation by domestic animals, noise, collecting, recreational activities, and other human intrusion (City of San Diego 1997). The MSCP, Appendix A (1997), also outlines species specific conditions of coverage for all covered species.” (Biological Survey Report for the North University Fire Station 50 Project, 2017).

Environmentally Sensitive Lands

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

The Fire Station 50 site is within Environmentally Sensitive Lands (ESL) as it relates Sensitive Biological Resources. Appropriate Mitigation Measures are proposed to address all concerns related to ESL as identified in the Biological Survey Report (Biological Survey Report for the North University Fire Station 50 Project, 2017).

Compatibility with the MHPA and MSCP

The proposed project would cause direct impacts to 0.79 acres within the MHPA and indirect impacts to biological resources in the MHPA along the eastern and southern boundaries. The project will also be required to comply with all MSCP Directives. Appropriate Mitigation Measures are proposed to address all concerns related to direct and indirect impacts associated with the project as identified in the Biological Survey Report (Biological Survey Report for the North University Fire Station 50 Project, 2017).

All potential impacts related to the presence of biological resources at the site would be reduced and addressed through the implementation of the Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Program (MMRP), as detailed within Section V of the Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND). With implementation of the monitoring program, potential impacts on resources would be reduced to less than significant.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Refer to response IV (a) above. The project site is identified with 0.01 of Southern Willow Scrub which is a riparian species. Impacts 0.01 and below are considered de minimus which does not require mitigation. As such, any impacts would be considered less than significant.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The project site does not contain any federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. No impacts would result. Also refer to response IV (a) above.

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

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

Per the North University Fire Station 50 Project Biological Survey Report, Page 27, "5.8 Wildlife Movement Corridors Wildlife movement corridors are defined as areas that connect suitable wildlife habitat areas in a region otherwise fragmented by rugged terrain, changes in vegetation, or human disturbance. Natural features such as canyon drainages, ridgelines, or areas with vegetation cover provide corridors for wildlife travel. Wildlife movement corridors are important, because they provide access to mates, food, and water; allow the dispersal of individuals away from high population density areas; and facilitate the exchange of genetic traits between populations (Beier and Loe 1992). Wildlife movement corridors are considered sensitive by resource and conservation agencies.

The survey area is bounded to the north, west, and south by existing roads or developments, but is located at the western edge of a relatively large swath of habitat within the MHPA and has connectivity with the Rose Canyon Open Space to the south. Because the project site is situated at a terminal pocket of this open space area and contains a large proportion of disturbed land, ornamental, and urban/developed land, which are non-sensitive cover types, the site contributes little value to the open space as a whole and virtually no value for wildlife movement." (Biological Survey Report for the North University Fire Station 50 Project, 2017) Based on this discussion/analysis, any impacts would be less than significant. Also refer to response IV (a) above.

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

Refer to response IV (a) above. As such, any impacts would be considered less than significant.

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

Refer to response IV (a) above. The project site is located within the City's Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA). Per the Biological Survey Report, Page 35, "...the proposed project would cause direct impacts to 0.79 acre within the MHPA (including 0.02 acre within the Mitigation Parcel). According to Section II.A.2 and II.B.1 of the City's Biology Guidelines (2012), essential public facilities are allowed to impact up to 30 percent of a parcel. As the project is a fire station that will serve the public interest and provide an essential service to the surrounding community, it qualifies as an essential public facility and is therefore a compatible land use within the MHPA per Section 1.4.1 of the MSCP (City of San Diego 1997). The total project impact represents less than 1 percent to the total lot acreage (92 acres), which is far below the 30 percent allowed for essential public facilities. Because total direct impacts are below this 30 percent threshold, an MHPA boundary line adjustment would not be required" (Biological Survey Report for the North University Fire Station 50 Project, 2017). Based on this discussion/analysis, any impacts would be less than significant.

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

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

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

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

Many areas of San Diego County, including mesas and the coast, are known for intense and diverse prehistoric occupation and important archaeological resources. The region has been inhabited by various cultural groups spanning 10,000 years or more. 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 the University Community Planning Area that requires special considerations with respect to the high potential archaeological sensitivity for project grading that could reveal unknown prehistoric resources.

A record search to determine presence or absence of potential resources within the project site was analyzed and discussed within the "Archaeological Resources Report for the North University City Fire Station 50 Project", Page 4 indicated "No cultural material was found within the APE during the survey. A section approximately 12 meters wide along Shoreline Drive was not surveyed due to the thick ornamental vegetation. The visibility in the remainder of the APE varied from 50 to 100 percent ground visibility. Road gravel covered the area immediately east of the ornamental vegetation. Tractor-pushed piles of gravel and naturally-occurring hands-sized cobbles were noted as well (Photograph 1). Handsized cobbles were scattered throughout the APE. Non-native grasses and weeds covered a portion within the central part of the APE. This area contained loosely compacted soils as opposed to the more compact soils downslope in the southeastern portion of the APE where native grasses were (Photograph 2). The southeastern portion of the APE is the only area that appears not to have been disturbed in the past. The remainder of the APE has been disturbed during the construction of Nobel Drive and Shoreline Drive. The northern edge has been disturbed and built-up during the construction of Nobel Drive (Photograph 3).

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

...The cultural resource investigations summarized herein satisfy the study and documentation requirements identified by City of San Diego Development Services staff and are consistent with the goals and policies of the City of San Diego as published in the Land Development Manual. Although no cultural material was identified during the survey, there are a number of resources within a 1-mile radius and therefore there is potential for unknown subsurface cultural resource deposits to occur in the undisturbed area. Because the project requires extensive grading within an area that has not been significantly disturbed, RECON recommends archaeological and Native American monitors during grading" (Archaeological Resources Report for the North University Fire Station 50 Project, San Diego, California, 2017).

Based on the preceding analysis/discussion, there is a potential for the project to impact archaeological resources and mitigation measures related to historical resources (archaeology) is required. All potential impacts related to the presence of archeological resources at the site would be reduced and addressed through the purview of a qualified Native American monitor. Monitoring by this individual would occur at all stages of ground-disturbing activities at the site. Furthermore, a Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Program (MMRP), as detailed within Section V of the Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND), would be implemented to address this issue specifically. With implementation of the historical resources monitoring program, potential impacts on historical resources would be reduced to less than significant.

Built 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. There are no existing structures on site. As such, no impacts would result.

AB 52 Consultation

Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52) requires as part of CEQA, evaluation of tribal cultural resources, notification of tribes, and opportunity for tribes to request a consultation regarding impacts to tribal cultural resources when a project is determined to require a Negative Declaration, Mitigated Negative Declaration or Environmental Impact Report under CEQA. In compliance with AB-52, the City notified all tribes that have previously requested such notification for projects within the City of San Diego. On June 30, 2016 the City of San Diego received a letter of interest from Iipay Nation of Santa Ysabel requesting to engage with the City for the purposes of AB 52. In order to implement AB 52 consultation, the City of San Diego Development Services Department (DSD) and the Iipay Nation of Santa Ysabel engaged in consultation for the project. Through this consultation process, it was determined no additional mitigation measures were needed to address this issue area in addition to what had already been recommended by the Archeological Resources Report for the project which will be incorporated into the Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Program (MMRP). Furthermore, since this document was first circulated, two additionally tribes (Jamul Band of Mission Indians, and Mesa Grande) contacted the City with respect to AB 52 Consultation. The City initiated and concluded the AB 52 Consultation process for this project. Jamul concurred with the proposed mitigation measures under the MMRP in addressing archeological resource monitoring and did not provide additional comments with respect to tribal cultural resources. Mesa Grande through communications with the City's tribal cultural liaison concurred with

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

proposed mitigation measures under the MMRP and did not provide additional comments with respect to tribal cultural resources.

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

Refer to response V (a) above.

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

According to the "Geology of the San Diego Metropolitan Area, California, La Jolla, 7.5 Minute Quadrangle Maps" (Kennedy and Peterson, 1975), the project site is primarily underlain the highly sensitive Scripps Formation. As a guideline dependent on history related to grading, paleontological monitoring may be required if project grading meets or exceeds the City's Thresholds of 2,000 cubic yards to 10 feet in depth.

As detailed within the project description, grading would encompass 4,300 yards of cutting, with a maximum cut depth of 10 feet. The project within its current configuration exceeds these thresholds; therefore, paleontological resource monitoring would be required.

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

Refer to response V (a) above. Although no known burial sites are known to be on the site, there is a potential for buried archaeological resources, including human remains, to be on-site. Please see Section V of the MND and the Initial Study. Furthermore, there are no dedicated cemeteries within the project site.

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. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

The project is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Fault Zone. The nearest fault to the project site is the Rose Canyon/Newport-Englewood Fault, located approximately 3 miles west of the site (Geotechnical Evaluation, Proposed Fire Station No. 50, August 18, 2016). Furthermore, the project would be required to comply with seismic requirement of the California Building Code, utilize

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

proper engineering design and utilization of standard construction practices, to be verified at the building permit stage, in order to ensure that potential impacts based on regional geologic hazards would remain less than significant and mitigation is not required.

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, in order to ensure that potential impacts from regional geologic hazards would remain less than significant and mitigation is not required.

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. Per the Geotechnical Investigative Report provided, "Based on the relatively dense nature of the materials encountered and absence of a shallow groundwater table, it is our opinion that liquefaction and seismically induced settlement at the subject site are not design considerations. (Geotechnical Evaluation, Proposed Fire Station No. 50, August 18, 2016)." Furthermore, the project would utilize proper engineering design and utilization of standard construction practices, to be verified at the building permit stage, in order to ensure that potential impacts from regional geologic hazards would remain less than significant and mitigation is not required.

iv) Landslides? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Per the Geotechnical Investigative Report provided, "...Based on our review of referenced geologic and topographic maps, literature, and stereoscopic aerial photographs, and our subsurface evaluation, large landslides or indications of deep seated landsliding have not been mapped or identified underlying the project site. It should be noted that two shallow landslides were identified in exploratory trenches excavated in the adjacent site to the south (SCT&T, 1984). These landslides were noted to occur within a siltstone section of the Scripps Formation and were relatively shallow in depth (i.e. approximately 3.5 to 7 feet). According to the referenced report, the landslides consisted of a zone of fractures that were associated with out-of-slope bedding and soil creep. The landslide materials were described as soft to stiff. Based on our site reconnaissance and our subsurface elevation, the subject site is underlain by competent materials of Scripps Formation that do not exhibit evidence of similar shallow landsliding, such as fractures and zones of soft clay" (Geotechnical Evaluation, Proposed Fire Station No. 50, 2016). The project would utilize proper engineering design and utilization of standard construction practices, to be verified at the building permit stage, in order to ensure that potential impacts from regional geologic hazards would remain less than significant and mitigation is not required.

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

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

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 potential impacts to a less than a significant level. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

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

The City of San Diego Seismic Safety Study Maps (1995 Edition, Map 30) have designated the geology at the project location as being within the City of San Diego Geologic Hazard Categories 54 (Other Terrain - steeply sloping terrain, unfavorable or fault controlled geologic structure, moderate risk). However, with the utilization of proper engineering design and utilization of standard construction practices, to be verified at the building permit stage, in order to ensure that potential impacts from regional geologic hazards would remain less than significant and mitigation is not required.

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

Per the Geotechnical Investigative Report provided, "Onsite fill materials and materials derived from the Scripps Formation are clayey in nature and possess a high potential for expansion. Therefore, these materials are not considered suitable for reuse within the building pad, as defined in the Remedial Grading section, as wall backfill and /or utility trench backfill. Imported select fill materials as defined herein, should be used within these areas" (Geotechnical Evaluation, Proposed Fire Station No. 50, 2016). With the recommendations of this report incorporated a "Project Design" conditions and given the fact the project would utilize proper engineering design and utilization of standard construction practices, to be verified at the building permit stage, potential impacts from regional geologic hazards would remain less than significant and mitigation is not required.

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

Not Applicable, as the project does not propose such structures.

VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS - Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
have a significant impact on the environment?				

The construction of the project is consistent with the land use and designated zone and would not be expected to have a significant impact related to greenhouse gases.

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

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

This Checklist is part of the CAP and contains measures that are required to be implemented on a project-by-project basis to ensure that the specified emissions targets identified in the CAP are achieved. Implementation of these measures would ensure that new development is consistent with the CAP's assumptions for relevant CAP strategies toward achieving the identified GHG reduction targets. Projects that are consistent with the CAP as determined through the use of this Checklist may rely on the CAP for the cumulative impacts analysis of GHG emissions. Projects that are not consistent with the CAP must prepare a comprehensive project-specific analysis of GHG emissions, including quantification of existing and projected GHG emissions and incorporation of the measures in this Checklist to the extent feasible. Cumulative GHG impacts would be significant for any project that is not consistent with the CAP.

Per the Climate Action Plan (CAP) Consistency Checklist, the proposed project will have a less-than-significant impact on the environment, either directly or indirectly, because the proposed project is consistent with the existing General Plan and Community Plan land use and underlying zoning designations. The proposed project is located in residential land use designation and is within the RS-1-14 (Residential Single-Unit) zone and meets the criteria for consistency with the General Plan, Community Plan land use and zoning designations. Furthermore the project will implement the following measures per the submitted Climate Action Plan Consistency Checklist for Fire Station 50:

"CAP Strategy 1. Energy and Water Efficient Buildings

1. Cool/Green Roofs

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. The project will use roofing materials with a minimum solar reflection index equal to or greater than the solar reflective index values specified in the voluntary measures of the California Green Building Code.				
2. Plumbing fixtures & fittings				
a. Kitchen Faucet – the project will use kitchen faucets that do not exceed a flow rate of 1.5 gallons per minute at 60 PSI.				
b. Dishwasher – the project will use a standard dishwasher that does not exceed 4.25 gallons per cycle.				
c. Clothes Washers – the project will use a clothes washer that does not exceed a water factor of 6 gallons per cubic feet of drum capacity.				

CAP Strategy 2. Clean & Renewable Energy

3. Energy Performance Standard / Renewable energy
 - a. The project's electrical plan is designed to have an energy budget that shows a 15% improvement when compared to the Title 24 (2013) Part 6 energy budget for proposed design building as calculated by Compliance software certified by the California energy Commission. The demand reduction may also be provided through onsite renewable energy.

CAP Strategy 3. Bicycle, Walking, Transit & Land Use

4. Electrical vehicle charging
 - a. Listed cabinet to be built with conduit for future connection of electric vehicle supply equipment.
5. Bicycle parking spaces.
 - a. The project is zoned RS-1-14 and will serve as a congregate residence to stationed fire fighters. The project will be considered an "Employment Use" in a Residential zone and therefore be classified as non-residential. There will be two parking spaces provided near ramp/walkway entrance on Nobel Dr.
6. Shower Facilities.
 - a. Not applicable (not more than 10 tenant occupants). The project is classified as non-residential but is does not have more than 10 tenant occupants (10 occupants) therefor has no requirement for changing/shower facilities. However, there will be 6 full bathrooms provided as part of the programming requirement by the San Diego Fire Department.

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
7. Designated parking spaces				
a. The project will provide 2 designated parking spaces for a combination of low-emitting, fuel-efficient, and carpool/vanpool vehicles.				
8. Transportation demand management program				
a. Not applicable (not more than 50 tenant occupants)"				

(Climate Action Plan (CAP) Consistency Checklist, Fire Station 50 Project, 2017)

With the incorporation of the preceding project design features, impacts from greenhouse gas emissions are considered less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required; however, the improvements as described within the checklist will be addressed within the project's Condition of Approval.

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

The project as proposed would not conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing greenhouse gas emissions in that it would be constructed in an established suburban area with services and facilities available. In addition, the project is consistent with the underlying zone and land use designation.

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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The project would result in the construction of a fire station on undeveloped parcel. The project site was not listed in any of the databases for hazardous materials including being listed in the State Water Resources Control Board GeoTracker system, which includes leaking underground fuel tank sites inclusive of spills, leaks, investigations, and cleanups Program or the Department of Toxic Substances Control EnviroStor Data Management System, which includes CORTESE sites.

Construction activities for the project would involve the use of potentially hazardous materials including vehicle fuels, oils, transmission fluids, paint, adhesives, surface coatings and other finishing materials, cleaning solvents, and pesticides for landscaping purposes. However, the use of these hazardous materials would be temporary, and all potentially hazardous materials would be stored, used, and disposed of in accordance with manufacturers' specifications, applicable federal, state, and local health and safety regulations. As such, impacts associated with the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials would be less than significant during construction.

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

With regard to operation, the new fire station would include an aboveground fuel storage tank and gas pump, oxygen tanks, and drums of engine oil. All potentially hazardous materials would be handled, used, and stored in accordance with manufacturers' specifications and applicable federal, state, and local health and safety regulations. With adherence to these measures no impacts should result at the operation phase.

- 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?

☐
☐
☒
☐

Refer to response VIII (a) above.

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

☐
☐
☒
☐

Please see response VII (a). The project site is within one-quarter mile of a school and the nearest school to the project site is University City High School, which is located approximately 750 feet to the south. Separating the project site and school, lies an existing three-story condominium complex, a canyon, and existing road road tracks with considerable topography. Any impacts will reduce to below a level of significance through the compliance with manufacturers' specifications and applicable federal, state, and local health and safety regulations. A Condition of Approval will address this concern in terms of the construction and operational phases of the project. As such, any 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?

☐
☐
☐
☒

A hazardous waste site records search was completed in December 2016 using Geotracker <https://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 hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

☐
☐
☐
☒

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

Activities associated with the necessary grading and construction would not increase the potential to result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in areas surrounding the project site. Long-term operation of the fire station facility would not interfere with the operations of any airport, specifically MCAS Miramar. Therefore, no significant impacts would occur, and no mitigation measures are required.

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

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

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

The project would not impair the implementation of, or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or evacuation plan. The proposed project would construct a new fire station that would facilitate and improve emergency access for fire trucks and apparatus. The proposed fire station would include up to new three apparatus bays, with all three being in "pull-through" configuration. With the pull-through bays, fire trucks would enter from the cul-de-sac at Shoreline Drive and Noble Drive, pull-through the building, and exit the project site via a new traffic controlled exit driveway at Nobel Drive. As designed, the proposed project would not have adverse impacts on an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Rather, the proposed project would result in beneficial impacts on emergency access and response. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

The Project site is located within the City's Multi-Habitat Preservation Area (MHPA), Brush Management Zones 1 and 2; therefore, a comprehensive Brush Management Plan must be established. Since the full Brush Management Zones cannot be provided entirely on-site, the proposed structures would have to meet alternative compliance measures. Alternative compliance measures are proposed to provide for fire rated walls and all openings shall incorporate dual glazed/dual tempered window panes. Additionally, all proposed landscaping adjoining the site shall not use invasive plant species. Landscaping adjacent to these areas shall use plant species naturally occurring in that area. With the incorporation of these project design features; any impacts would be reduced to a level below significance.

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY - Would the project:

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The project would comply with all storm water quality standards during and after construction, and appropriate Best Management Practices (BMP's) will be utilized and provided for on-site. 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.

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

The project does not require the construction of wells. The project is located within a developed residential neighborhood with existing public water supply infrastructure. The proposed project would generate an incremental increase in water demand. As such, operation of the proposed project would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies. As such, any impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

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, and no mitigation measures are required.

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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

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

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

occur on or adjacent to the project site. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

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

☐
☐
☒
☐

The project would 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. Per the "Priority Development Project (PDP) Storm Water Quality Management Plan (SWQMP) For Fire Station 50":

"In its existing state runoff from the site flows to the south, southwest and southeast, where it is picked up by a storm drain at a headwall along the southerly boundary APN 345-010-03-00 as shown on City of San Diego drawing 22324-11-D. Additional site runoff flows onto Shoreline Drive, westerly and southwesterly of the site and into a curb inlet within that cul-de-sac, shown on the same drawing. A small area of runoff from the site flows onto Nobel Drive and to a curb inlet at the southeast intersection of Nobel Drive and Shoreline Drive, as shown on drawing 29532-21-D. A small area of offsite runoff flows onto the site and is conveyed to Nobel Drive. Following construction the same general pattern of runoff and its collection continues. The impervious surface runoff is conveyed to three flow through planters, where it is treated and detained before being conveyed southerly to the aforementioned storm drain and headwall. The pervious surface runoff will flow to two curb outlets in Shoreline Drive and a portion of the site runoff and offsite runoff conveyed to the site will continue to flow onto Nobel Drive.

Runoff to the public storm drain system will increase by 0.36 cfs total for the entire site (1.94 cfs - 1.58 cfs) with an increase to the drain and headwall southerly of the site of 0.40 cfs. The existing drain was checked for adequacy and found to be capable of conveying the additional runoff. There will be no adverse effect to the public storm drain" (Priority Development Project (PDP) Storm Water Quality Management Plan (SWQMP) for Fire Station 50, 2016)

As such, any impacts would be less than significant with incorporation of "Project Design" features addressing drainage. As such, no mitigation measures are required.

- f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

☐
☐
☒
☐

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, and no mitigation measures are required.

- g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood

☐
☐
☐
☒

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

See Response (IX) (g). No impacts would result.

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING – Would the project:

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

The proposed project is located within the Central Subarea of the University Community Plan (UCP) and is designated for Residential use, 15-30 dwelling units per acre. The site is surrounded by residential development to the north, south and west, and open-space to east. The site is subject to the Community Plan Implementation Overlay Zone (CPIOZ) Type 'A' and is located within MCAS Miramar's Area of Influence and the 60-65 Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) contour. Within the UCP, the CPIOZ Type 'A' is the major implementation tool for the Development Intensity Element. The purpose of the overlay zone is to limit uses and development intensity to the levels specified in the Land Use and Development Intensity Table of the UCP. Figure 26 of the Development Intensity Element identifies the site within Subarea 39. Table 3 of the Development Intensity Element further identifies that the development intensity within the subarea not exceed 30 dwelling units per acre of residential use. The Public Facilities Element of the UCP was amended in December 2006 to add language citing the need for additional public safety related facilities (police, fire, and emergency medical response) to assure levels of service standards are attained for existing development and as development occurs. The UCP Public Facilities Element also states the new public safety related facilities should have good vehicular access and be carefully reviewed for environmental, land use and aesthetic impacts. As proposed, the project meets all of the preceding objectives and does not exhibit characteristics in terms of physically dividing 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 general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

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

See Response X (a). The project is consistent with the General Plan's and the University Community Plan's Land Use designation. The project site is located within a developed residential neighborhood and surrounded by similar residential development and areas of open-space to the east. The site is located within the City's Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA). The project will impact biological resources indirectly and directly. All potential impacts related to the presence of biological resources at the site would be reduced and addressed through the implementation of the Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Program (MMRP), as detailed within Section V of the Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND). With implementation of the biological resources monitoring program, potential impacts on biological resources would be reduced to less than significant.

- c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

☐
☒
☐
☐

See Response X (a) through (b). All potential impacts related to the presence of biological resources at the site would be reduced and addressed through the implementation of the Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Program (MMRP), as detailed within Section V of the Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND). With implementation of the biological resources monitoring program, potential impacts on biological resources would be reduced to less than significant.

With development of the proposed fire station, the parcel exceeds the 30 percent allowed development area for an essential public facility on a premise containing MHPA pursuant to the City of San Diego Land Development Code, ESL Regulations. To address to this impact, a BLA Equivalency Analysis was conducted (RECON September 26, 2017). This BLA proposes a 1.95:1 "give to take" ratio, which includes a net MHPA addition of 0.197 acre and 0.582 acre of native grassland restoration and native grassland/coastal sage scrub revegetation beyond that needed for project mitigation plus 0.284 acre of native grassland restoration and 0.298 acre of native grassland/coastal sage scrub revegetation beyond that needed for project mitigation. This would result in a net increase in the acreage of Tier I, II, and IIIB habitats preserved. The habitat quality within the area proposed for addition into the MHPA; the proposed native grassland and coastal sage scrub restoration and revegetation; and the removal of invasive ornamental plantings, non-native grassland, and disturbed habitat would improve overall habitat value within the MHPA. Thus, the slight loss of Tier II habitat (Diegan coastal sage scrub) will be offset by a larger increase in Tier I habitat (valley needlegrass grassland), combined with eradication of invasive species vanilla-scented wattle and Mexican fan palm from the MHPA in the southwest corner of the parcel, and revegetation with native grassland species. As a result, the proposed BLA is anticipated to have an overall beneficial effect on the MHPA preserve. This proposed land exchange complies with the overall MSCP policy for BLAs, as the proposed BLA would result in equal or higher biological values of the preserve to species and habitats. This conclusion is based on the comparison of biological value provided by the evaluation of the six biological factors required by the MSCP for a MHPA BLA.

XI. MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the project?

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

There are no known mineral resources located on the project site. The 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. This project site is located in a developed neighborhood and adjacent to the MHPA which is not suitable for mineral extraction. Additionally, the site has never been used for mineral extraction. Therefore, the project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region or the residents of the state. No impacts would occur.

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

See 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. Therefore, no significant impacts were identified, and no mitigation measures are required.

XII. NOISE – Would the project result in:

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

Per the submitted "Noise Analysis for the North University City Fire Station 50 Project, San Diego, California, 2017.":

Short Term/Construction

Short-term noise impacts would be associated with onsite grading, and construction activities for 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.

Long Term/Operational

Emergency Response Sirens

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

The project is anticipated have an average of 11 responses (22 trips) per day. The primary source of noise associated with fire engines and ambulances are sirens. Sirens are assumed to be active during outbound trips and inactive during return trips. Thus, on average 11 outbound trips with active sirens would happen each day. While active, sirens typically generate noise levels of 120 dB(A) at 10 feet. Fire engines were assumed to travel in the left most during emergency responses.

The noise-sensitive receivers nearest to the outbound driveway of the station are apartments in the Lucera Apartments at UTC complex. These receivers are approximately 370 feet southeast of the driveway. During emergency responses and equipment testing, sirens may expose these receivers to instantaneous exterior noise levels of up to 89 dB(A) Lmax. Accounting for the duration of it takes emergency vehicles to leave the fire station, this would result in noise levels of 63 dB(A) Leq.

On average, emergency responses would include 7 outbound trips traveling west on Nobel Drive, 3 outbound trips traveling east on Nobel Drive, and 1 outbound trip traveling north on Shoreline Drive. Eastbound emergency vehicles would not pass noise-sensitive receivers. Westbound and northbound emergency vehicles would pass within 65 and 100 feet of residences in the Capri at Renaissance La Jolla condominium complex, respectively. When emergency vehicles pass the nearest residence, instantaneous noise levels may reach up to 104 dB(A) Lmax. Accounting for the duration of noise, this would result in noise levels of 75 dB(A) Leq.

As discussed above, emergency responses may result in noise levels of up to 104 dB(A) Lmax at nearby residences. Accounting for typical exterior-to-interior noise level reductions interior noise levels at adjacent residences may reach up to 79 dB(A) Lmax (FHWA 2011). These noise levels may interrupt normal activities, however would be only last for several seconds. Additionally, the City operates 47 fire stations within city limits (Station 1, Stations 3–47, and Station 51). Most of these stations are immediately adjacent to residential uses. Therefore, project generated noise levels at residential uses would be similar to noise levels adjacent to existing fire stations. Section 59.5.0402 of the City's Noise Ordinance exempts "emergency vehicles when being used in emergency situations, including the blowing of sirens and/or horns" from all noise standards. Thus, emergency response vehicles including fire engines and ambulances would not exceed noise standards.

Traffic Noise

As shown in Figure 5, ground-floor noise levels are projected to be 70 CNEL or less across the project site. Modeled noise levels at the building façade of the offices would reach up to 67 CNEL. Fire stations are not typically considered noise-sensitive land uses and the City has not adopted noise compatibility criteria for fire stations. Associated activities including sleep may be disrupted if interior noise levels exceed 45 CNEL. Standard construction techniques would provide an exterior-to-interior noise reduction of 25 dB when windows are closed. Thus, interior noise levels would be 42 CNEL or lesser when windows are closed. As interior noise levels would not exceed 45 CNEL, the project would be compatible with traffic noise levels.

Project-generated traffic would increase traffic volumes on local roadways. Noise level increases would be greatest nearest the project site, which would represent the greatest concentration of

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

project-related traffic. As shown in Table 9, the project traffic would contribute to less than a decibel increase in the noise levels of adjacent roadways. Thus, noise level increases would be less than perceptible. The project would not contribute to a substantial increase in traffic noise from worker commute trips. Noise from emergency response vehicles is exempt from City noise standards (Municipal Code Section 59.5.0402[b]).

Aircraft Noise

The project site is within the 60 CNEL contour of MCAS Miramar. Thus, aircraft noise levels may range from 60 to 65 CNEL. Based on noise compatibility criteria established in the MCAS Miramar ALUCP, fire stations are compatible with noise levels up to 65 CNEL. As aircraft noise levels would not exceed the applicable compatibility criteria the project would be compatible with aircraft noise from MCAS Miramar.

On-site Generated Noise

On-site noise sources would include parking lot activity and mechanical equipment such as, a SCBA cylinder recharging station, two HVAC units, and a standby generator. Parking activity associated with the project would be less intensive than parking lot activity associated with adjacent uses, which do not exceed the City's Noise Ordinance. Thus, project parking lot activities are not anticipated to exceed the noise level limits from the City's Noise Control Ordinance.

When the SCBA cylinder recharging station, HVAC units, and standby generator are operated under peak load and vehicle bay doors are open, noise levels along adjacent property lines would reach up to 42 dB(A). As discussed in Section 3.1.1, the City's Noise Ordinance establishes a daytime noise level limit of 55 dB(A) Leq and a nighttime noise level limit of 45 dB(A) Leq at multi-family land uses (Municipal Code Section 59.5.0401[a]). Therefore, project mechanical equipment would not result in noise levels that exceed applicable daytime or nighttime noise level limits established in the City's Noise Ordinance (Municipal Code Section 59.5.0401[a])." (Noise Analysis for the North University City Fire Station 50 Project, San Diego, California, 2016)"

With compliance to the City's construction noise requirements, project construction and operational noise levels would be reduced to less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required. As stated previously, Emergency Noise conditions exempt emergency vehicles from noise thresholds when being used in emergency situations, including the "blowing of sirens and/or horns" from all noise standards.

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

See response XII (a) above. Potential short-term effects from construction noise would be reduced through compliance with City restrictions. No significant long-term impacts would occur, and no mitigation measures are required.

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

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

See response XII (a). The project would not significantly increase long-term (ambient) noise levels; other than short-term emergency response generated noise, which is exempt from noise thresholds per the City's municipal code. Post-construction noise levels and traffic would slightly increase by one decibel, as modeled in comparison to noise levels with the surrounding existing residential and open-space uses. As such, a less than significant impact would result, and no mitigation measures are required.

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

See response XII (a). The project would not expose people to a substantial increase in temporary or periodic ambient noise levels. Construction noise would result during grading 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, with the exemption of short term impacts associated with emergency response activities. Implementation of these standard measures would reduce potential impacts from an increase in ambient noise level during construction to a less than significant level, and no mitigation measures are required.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The project site is located within the MCAS Miramar airport land use plan. Per the acoustical analysis, "The project site is within the 60 CNEL contour of MCAS Miramar. Thus, aircraft noise levels may range from 60 to 65 CNEL. Based on noise compatibility criteria established in the MCAS Miramar Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP), fire stations are compatible with noise levels up to 65 CNEL. As aircraft noise levels would not exceed the applicable compatibility criteria, the project would also be compatible with aircraft noise from MCAS Miramar. (Noise Analysis for the North University City Fire Station 50 Project, San Diego, California, 2016)" Based on this criteria, no significant impacts would result, and as such no mitigation measures are required.

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

issue	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. As such 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)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

No permanent residences or major infrastructure that could induce population growth are included as part of the proposed project. The proposed project consists of the development of a new fire station. The proposed project would serve an existing and forecasted population in the City of San Diego. Therefore, the proposed project would not induce substantial population growth. As such, no impacts would occur.

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

The project site is currently undeveloped and no such displacement of housing would occur with this project. Therefore, the proposed project would not displace existing housing or people, nor necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. As such, no impacts would occur.

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

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

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES

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

The proposed project consists of the development of a Fire Station to serve existing and forecasted population in the City and to improve emergency response time in the University City community. Per University Community Plan, the project meets the intent of implementing the Public Facilities Element: "The University community is served by a police substation and fire station located on Eastgate Mall between Regents Road and Genesee Avenue. Additional public safety related facilities and services (e.g., police, fire, and emergency medical response) should be provided to assure levels of service standards are attained for existing development and as development occurs. New facilities should have good vehicular access and be carefully reviewed

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

for environmental, land use and aesthetic impacts. Appropriate equipment and staffing should be assigned to the facilities to assure adequate response to the population and the structure types which may exist in the community.”

Furthermore, construction of the new fire station would provide enhanced facilities and capacity for the San Diego Fire Department (SDFD) to provide fire protection and emergency services. Staffing for this station would increase. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a negative impact on fire protection and emergency services provided by the SDFD. Rather, the proposed project would result in a beneficial impact on fire protection services.

The project site is located in an urbanized area where fire protection services are already provided. The Project site is located within and adjacent to the City's Multi-Habitat Preservation Area (MHPA), California State Park land, and within high fire sensitive area; therefore, a comprehensive Brush Management Plan must be established. Since the full Brush Management Zones cannot be provided entirely on-site, the proposed structures would have to meet alternative compliance measures. Alternative compliance measures are proposed to provide for fire rated walls and all openings shall incorporate dual glazed/dual tempered window panes. Additionally, all proposed landscaping adjoining the southern and eastern perimeter of the site would not use invasive plant species. Landscaping adjacent to these areas shall use plant species naturally occurring in that area. Construction of the project would not adversely affect existing levels of fire protection services to the area, would in fact improve it with the construction of the facility, and would not require the construction of new, or expansion of, existing governmental facilities. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

ii) Police Protection ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

The proposed project would result in a significant environmental impact if new or physically altered police protection facilities would need to be built to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for police protection. The proposed project is not a type of land use typically associated with the need for police protection. With the Project, the level of policing required would not increase in comparison to existing conditions. Therefore, new or physically altered police protection facilities would not need to be built, and no impacts would occur.

iii) Schools ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

It is anticipated that both the construction workers and the firefighters who would work in the station would be drawn from the local area and that the project would not increase the population of San Diego. Therefore, the Project would not generate any demand for increased school services. As such, no impacts would occur.

v) Parks ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

The proposed project is not a type of land use typically associated with the need for additional park space. As such, no impacts would occur.

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
vi) Other public facilities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The proposed Project would not increase the resident population generating a need for additional public facilities (example libraries, etc.). See Response XIV (a)(i) through (v) for additional details, As such, no impacts would occur.

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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

As discussed in Section XV (a) Population and Housing, the proposed project consists of the construction of a new fire station to serve existing and forecasted population in the City. No population growth would occur as a result of the proposed project. As such, the proposed project would not result in an increased demand for parks or recreational services. No impacts would occur.

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

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. No impacts would result.

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 freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

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

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

With regards to intersection issues, the project's location is specifically identified within the City General Plan for a fire facility. In terms of impacts to the circulation system, it was determined within the project's "Fire Station 50 – Traffic Memorandum", "Construction of the project was found not to conflict with existing or future Levels of Service (LOS) as it relates to local roadways, (Noble Drive and at the Shoreline Drive) as detailed in the "Fire Station 50 – Traffic Memorandum" Page 3, "Project traffic for the AM and PM peak hours were added to existing traffic at the intersection of Nobel Drive at Shoreline Drive. Intersection delays and level of service for the Existing With Project peak hour traffic is provided in Attachment 8 which shows Nobel Drive at Shoreline Drive is projected to operate at an acceptable level of service i.e. LOS C in the AM peak hour and LOS D in the PM peak hour. A project impact occurs if project traffic causes a street segment or intersection to operate at an unacceptable level of service i.e. LOS "E" or "F" and/or exceeds the significance thresholds outlined in the City's Significant Determination Thresholds (April 2004). Attachment 9 shows the street segment and intersection LOS comparison tables. As shown, both study street segments and the intersection of Nobel Drive / Shoreline Drive operate at acceptable levels of service without and with Fire Station 50. There are no direct significant impacts to study street segments or intersection as a result of the proposed Fire Station 50. Therefore, no mitigation is required" (Fire Station 50 – Traffic Memorandum, 2017).

In terms of interruption of mass transit, Bus Route 204 currently travels along Nobel Drive that ultimately connects to the University Towne Center (UTC) Transit Center. There is an existing bus stop on Nobel Drive is located approximately 175 feet west of Shoreline Drive on the north side of the street for Bus Route 204. The project as design would not directly impact the location of this stop. The only modification in this area is at the new exit driveway to east and the traffic signal loop with a controlled emergency vehicle detector (EVP). Access would continue to be afforded to mass transit with very limited infrequent interruptions when a fire engine exits the facility.

Construction of the project is consistent and compatible with the existing pedestrian improvements along Noble and Shoreline Drive and the development of the site would not interfere with any planned future pedestrian connections or linkages. Furthermore, an existing Class II bike path is currently provided along Nobel Drive and would remain in place with this project. The University Community Plan "Figure 23", identifies a Class II bicycle facility for this location as the ultimate roadway condition. The only modification in this area is the new exit driveway and traffic signal with controlled EVP. Access would continue to be provided to both pedestrian and bicyclist with limited interruptions when a fire engine exits the facility. All in all, impacts would considered less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

- 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. The project would not conflict with any applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system. Impacts are considered less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

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

- 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. The project is located within the adopted 2005 MCAS Miramar Airport Influence Area. The site is within the 2008 MCAS Miramar Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan within the 60-65 dB Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) noise contours. Outside accident zones, beneath the approach/departure and conical surfaces for MCAS Miramar. The proposed project was found to be consistent with ALCUZ land use compatibility guidelines for Miramar Operations. The proposed height of the structure was found not to penetrate any Federal Aviation Administration Part 77 airspace at a height of 38'-6". 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 alter existing circulation patterns on Noble and Shoreline Drive. Both Shoreline Drive and Noble Drive, and the new driveway exit from the Fire Station at Noble Drive were analyzed for both vehicle and pedestrian safety. It was determined City Transportation and Engineering safety staff the project as proposed would not result an increase hazard due to site's design features pertaining to intersection improvements. No impacts would result.

- e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

The project would not result in inadequate emergency access; however, would in fact improve emergency access with the additional circulation enhancements as it relates to this project. 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?

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Refer to response XVI (a) above. Any impacts would be less than significant.

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:

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

- 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

☐
☐
☐
☒

No tribal cultural resources as defined by Public Resources Code section 21074 have been identified on the project site. This issue area was further analyzed through the AB 52 consultation process with the Lipay Nation of Santa Ysabel, Jamul Indian Village of Kumeyaay Nation, and Mesa Grande Band of Mission Indians in terms of impacts. Furthermore, the project site was not determined to be eligible for listing on either the State or local register of historical resources.

- b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

☐
☐
☐
☒

No significant resources pursuant to subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1 have been identified on the project site. Please see discussion in V (a) above.

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. A minor increase in demand for wastewater disposal or treatment would be created by the project, as compared to current conditions. The proposed fire station 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, and no mitigation measures are required.

- b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing

☐
☐
☒
☐

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

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

See response XVIII (a) above. Adequate services are available to serve the project site. Additionally, the proposed fire station 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, and no mitigation measures are required.

- 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, and no mitigation measures are required.

- 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 fire station 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, and no mitigation measures are required.

- 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 construction of the project. All construction waste from the project site would be transported to an appropriate facility, which

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

would have sufficient permitted capacity to accept that generated by the project. Long-term operation of the residential use is anticipated to generate typical amounts of solid waste associated with residential uses. Furthermore, the project would be required to comply with the City's Municipal Code requirement for diversion of both construction waste during the short-term, construction phase and solid waste during the long-term, operational phase. Impacts are considered to be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

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

The project would comply with all Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to the handling and disposal of 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, and no mitigation measures are required.

XVIX. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE –

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

The proposed Project involves the construction of a new fire station to better serve the projected increase in population growth in the City of San Diego, specifically within the University Community Planning Area. The selected site for the new fire station meets the needs of the community and Fire Department. Furthermore, the location will help meet the Fire Department's response time standards in the North University City area. The site is within an established residential neighborhood, adjacent to open-space area to east. This analysis has determined that, although there is the potential of significant impacts related to Historical Resources (Archaeology), Biological Resources, Land Use, and Paleontological 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 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

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

Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant actions taking place over time. For the purpose of this Initial Study, the project may have cumulative considerable impacts to Historical Resources (Archaeology), Biological Resources, Land Use, and Paleontological Resources. As such, mitigation measures included in this document would reduce these potential impacts to a 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 potential impacts to less than significant, or to the extent possible. As such, the project is not anticipated to contribute to potentially significant cumulative environmental impacts.

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

The construction of a new fire station is consistent with the setting and with the use anticipated by the City (University Community Plan – Public Facilities Element). Based on the analysis presented above, implementation of the aforementioned mitigation measures would reduce environmental impacts such that no substantial adverse effects on humans would occur.

INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

REFERENCES

I. Aesthetics / Neighborhood Character

- ☒ City of San Diego General Plan.
- ☒ Community Plans: University Community Plan
- ☒ Site Specific Report: Proposed Site Exhibit, Architectural Drawings

II. Agricultural Resources & Forest Resources

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

III. Air Quality

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

IV. Biology

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

X Site Specific Report: Biological Survey Report for the North University Fire Station 50 Project, San Diego, California, RECON Environmental, Inc. Brian Parker, Associate Biologist, February 20, 2017.

X Site Specific Report: Native Grassland Restoration Plan for the North University Fire Station 50 Project, San Diego, California, RECON Environmental, Inc. Brian Parker, Associate Biologist, September 14, 2017.

V. Cultural Resources (includes Historical Resources)

X City of San Diego Historical Resources Guidelines

X City of San Diego Archaeology Library

___ Historical Resources Board List

___ Community Historical Survey:

X Site Specific Report: Archaeological Resources Report for the North University Fire Station 50 Project, San Diego, California, RECON Environmental, Inc. Carmen Zepeda-Herman, Principal Investigator, February 20, 2017.

VI. Geology/Soils

X City of San Diego Seismic Safety Study

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

X Site Specific Report(s): Geotechnical Evaluation, Proposed Fire Station No. 50, Ninyo & Moore, August 18, 2016.

VII. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

X Site Specific Report: Climate Action Plan (CAP) Consistency Checklist, Fire Station 50 Project, March 13, 2017.

VIII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

___ San Diego County Hazardous Materials Environmental Assessment Listing

___ San Diego County Hazardous Materials Management Division

___ FAA Determination

- ___ State Assessment and Mitigation, Unauthorized Release Listing, Public Use Authorized
- X State Water Resources Control Board GeoTracker: <http://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/>
- ___ Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan
- ___ Site Specific Report:

IX. Hydrology/Water Quality

- X Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM)
- X Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), National Flood Insurance Program-Flood Boundary and Floodway Map
- ___ Clean Water Act Section 303(b) list, http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/tmdl/303d_lists.html
- X Site Specific Report: Priority Development Project (PDP) Storm Water Quality Management Plan (SWQMP) for Fire Station 50, Christensen Engineering & Surveying, December 15, 2016.

X. Land Use and Planning

- X City of San Diego General Plan
- X Community Plans: University
- X Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan
- X City of San Diego Zoning Maps
- X FAA Determination
- X Site Specific Report: [Multi-Habitat Planning Area Boundary Line Adjustment Equivalency Analysis for the North University City Fire Station 50 Project by RECON, dated September 25, 2017](#)

XI. Mineral Resources

- ___ California Department of Conservation - Division of Mines and Geology, Mineral Land Classification
- ___ Division of Mines and Geology, Special Report 153 - Significant Resources Maps
- ___ Site Specific Report:

XII. Noise

- ☒ City of San Diego General Plan
- ☐ Community Plan
- ☐ San Diego International Airport - Lindbergh Field CNEL Maps
- ☐ Brown Field Airport Master Plan CNEL Maps
- ☐ Montgomery Field CNEL Maps
- ☐ San Diego Association of Governments - San Diego Regional Average Weekday Traffic Volumes
- ☐ San Diego Metropolitan Area Average Weekday Traffic Volume Maps, SANDAG
- ☒ Site Specific Report: Noise Analysis for the North University City Fire Station 50 Project, San Diego, California, RECON Environmental, Inc. Jack T. Emerson, Noise Analyst, February 20, 2017.

XIII. Paleontological Resources

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

XIV. Population / Housing

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

XV. Public Services

☒ City of San Diego General Plan

☒ Community Plans: University

XVI. Recreational Resources

☒ City of San Diego General Plan

☒ Community Plans: University

☐ Department of Park and Recreation

☐ City of San Diego - San Diego Regional Bicycling Map

☐ Additional Resources:

XVII. Transportation / Circulation

☒ City of San Diego General Plan

☒ Community Plans: Community Plans: University

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

☐ San Diego Region Weekday Traffic Volumes, SANDAG

☒ Site Specific Report: Fire Station 50 – Traffic Memorandum, Urban Systems Associates, Inc., March 1, 2017

XVIII. Utilities

☒ City of San Diego General Plan

☐ Site Specific Report:

XIX. Water Conservation

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

Created: REVISED - October 11, 2013