

# SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

Project No. 336364 SCH No. 2014091073 SEIR to EIR No. 91-0360 (SCH No. 92121002)

SUBJECT: **CAMPUS POINT MASTER PLAN**: The project is requesting a COMMUNITY PLAN AMENDMENT to the University Community Plan, a SITE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT (SDP), and NEIGHBORHOOD DEVELOPMENT PERMIT (NDP) to allow for the intensification of an existing 731,725-square-foot scientific research and development facility by 328,383 square feet. This would allow for a 1,060,108-square-foot science and business park campus, with a comprehensive site design and landscaping. The project would include the construction of a 12- and 6-story, split-level, multi-tenant building, and a 2-story building housing a micro-brewery with accessory dining space and shared tenant amenity spaces. In addition, a 9-level (including three subterranean levels) parking structure with 1,500 parking stalls would be constructed on the 58.19-acres project site. The site is located at 10290 to 10300 Campus Point Drive, at the northern terminus of Campus Point Drive north of Genesee Avenue, west of Interstate 5, and east of Roselle Street (APNs 343-230-13 and 343-230-14). The site is within the Central Subarea of the University Community Plan area, and is within the IP-1-1 (Industrial Park), RS-1-7 (Residential Single-Family), and RS-1-14 (Residential Single-Family) zones, Steep Hillsides, Parking Impact, Community Plan Implementation Overlay Zone (CPIOZ) Areas "A" & "B", Airport Influence Area (AIA) of MCAS Miramar, and the Accident Potential Zone (A PZ) 2.

NOTE: Minor revisions/corrections have been made to this final SEIR. Changes are shown in strikeout/underline format.

#### **ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION:**

This document has been prepared by the City of San Diego's Environmental Analysis Section under the direction of the Development Services Department and is based on the City's independent analysis and conclusions made pursuant to 21082.1 and 15163 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Statutes and Sections 128.0103(a), 128.0103(b) of the San Diego Land Development Code.

Based on the analysis conducted for the project described above, the City of San Diego, as the Lead Agency, has prepared the following Supplemental Environmental Impact Report. The analysis conducted identified that the project could result in significant impacts to the following issue area(s):

Land Use, Transportation/Circulation, Biological Resources, Historical Resources, and Paleontological Resources.

The purpose of this document is to inform decision-makers, agencies, and the public of the significant environmental effects that could result if the project is approved and implemented, identify possible ways to minimize the significant effects, and describe reasonable alternatives to the project.

#### **PUBLIC REVIEW DISTRIBUTION:**

The following agencies, organizations, and individuals received a copy or notice of the draft Environmental Impact Report and were invited to comment on its accuracy and sufficiency. Copies of the Environmental Impact Report, the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program and any technical appendices may be reviewed in the offices of the Development Services Department, or purchased for the cost of reproduction.

## FEDERAL GOVERNMENT U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (23) Federal Aviation Administration (1) MCAS Miramar Air Station (13)

## State of California

Caltrans, District 11 (31) California Department of Fish and Wildlife (32) Department of Toxic Substance Control (39) State Clearinghouse (46A) California Transportation Commission (51) California Department of Transportation (51A) California Department of Transportation (51B) Native American Heritage Commission (56)

#### CITY OF SAN DIEGO

Mayor's Office (91) Councilmember Lightner, District 1 (MS 10A) Councilmember Zapf, District 2 (MS 10A) Councilmember Gloria, District 3 (MS 10A) Councilmember Cole, District 4 (MS 10A) Councilmember Kersey, District 5 (MS 10A) <u>CITY OF SAN DIEGO - CONTINUED</u> Councilmember Cate, District 6 (MS 10A) Councilmember Sherman, District 7 (MS 10A) Councilmember Alvarez, District 8 (MS 10A) Councilmember Emerald, District 9 (MS 10A) Development Services Department

EAS – M Blake Transportation – E Alberto Code Enforcement Division – M Richmond

Engineering - | Canning Geology - J Quinn Landscaping – L Radcliffe-Meyers Planning Review – C Murphy Project Manager – J Peterson **Planning Department** Plan-Facilities Financing – F January Park and Recreation - J Harkness Plan-Long Range Planning – D Monroe Plan-MSCP - H Smit-Kicklighter San Diego Police Department (MS 776) San Diego Fire and Rescue (80) Environmental Services Department (93A) L Wood Transportation Development - DSD (78) **Development Coordination (78A)** Fire and Life Safety Services (79) Library Department - Government Documents (81) Central Library (81A) University Community Branch Library (81) North University Branch Library (81) Historical Resources Board (87) City Attorney (59)

OTHER INTERESTED GROUPS, ORGANIZATIONS, AND INDIVIDUALS San Diego Association of Governments (108) San Diego County Regional Airport Authority (110) Metropolitan Transit System (112) San Diego Gas & Electric (114) Rancho Santa Ana Botanic Garden at Claremont (161) Sierra Club (165) San Diego Natural History Museum (166) San Diego Audubon Society (167) San Diego Audubon Society (167A) California Native Plant Society (170) Citizens Coordinate for Century III (179) Endangered Habitats League (182) Endangered Habitats League (182A) Carmen Lucas (206) South Coastal Information Center (210) San Diego History Center (211) San Diego Archaeological Center (212) Save Our Heritage Organisation (214) Ron Christman (215) Clint Linton (215B) Frank Brown – Inter-Tribal Cultural Resources Council (216) Camp Band of Mission Indians (217)

San Diego County Archaeological Society, Inc. (218) Kumeyaay Cultural Heritage Preservation (223) Kumeyaay Cultural Repatriation Committee (225) Native American Distribution [Notice Only] (225A-S) University City Community Planning Group (480) The Guardian (481) Marian Bear Natural Park Recreation (485) University City Community Association (486) Friends of Rose Canyon (487) La Jolla Village Community Council (489) Chamber of Commerce (482) Debbie Knight Gensler Architect Alexandria Real Estate RECON

## **RESULTS OF PUBLIC REVIEW:**

- () No comments were received during the public input period.
- () Comments were received but did not address the accuracy or completeness of the draft environmental document. No response is necessary and the letters are incorporated herein.
- (X) Comments addressing the accuracy or completeness of the draft environmental document were received during the public input period. The letters and responses are incorporated herein.

Kerry M. Santoro Deputy Director Development Services Department

November 21, 2016 Date of Draft Report

April 5, 2017 Date of Final Report

Analyst: Blake

# Campus Point SEIR Letters of Comment and Responses

Letters of comment to the Draft SEIR were received from the following agencies, organizations, and individuals. Several comment letters received during the Draft SEIR public review period contained accepted revisions that resulted in changes to the final SEIR text. These changes to the text are indicated by strike-out (deleted) and underline (inserted) markings. The letters of comment and responses follow.

## Agencies and Organizations

А	State Clearinghouse	RTC-2
В	California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)	RTC-3
С	California Department of Fish and Wildlife	RTC-5
D	California Department of Toxic Substances Control	RTC-7
Е	Metropolitan Transit System	RTC-10
F	Rincon Band of Luiseno Indians	RTC-17
G	San Diego Association of Governments	RTC-18
Н	San Diego County Archaeological Society	RTC-20
I	University Community Planning Group	RTC-21
J	Friends of Rose Canyon	RTC-31



	Letter B	
	STATE OF CALIFORNIA—CALIFORNIA STATE TRANSPORTATION AGENCY EDMUND G. BROWN Jr., Governor	
	DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION DISTRICT 11, DIVISION OF PLANNING 4050 TAYLOR ST, MS, 240 SAN DIEGO, CA 92110 PHONE (619) 688-6960 FAX (619) 688-4299 TTY 711 www.dot.ca.gov	
	January 4, 2017	
	11-SD-5 PM 29.46 SCH#2014091073/DSEIR Environmental Planner City of San Diego Development Services Center 1222 First Avenue, Fifth Floor	
	San Diego, CA 92101 Dear Ms. Blake:	B-1
	Thank you for including the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) in the environmental review process for the project referenced above. The mission of Caltrans is to provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California's economy and livability. The Local Development-Intergovernmental Review (LD-IGR) Program reviews land use projects and plans to ensure consistency with our mission and state planning priorities.	B-2
	Caltrans received a copy of the proposed Campus Point Master Plan Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) located near Interstate 5 (I-5). Caltrans has the following comments:	
B-1	<ol> <li>The SEIR and the Traffic Impact Study (TIS) both state that the Campus Point Project generates direct impacts to the segment along Genesse Avenue between the Interstate 5 (I-5) southbound (SB) ramps and the I-5 northbound (NB) ramps, as well as the intersection between I-5 SB ramps and Genesse Avenue.</li> </ol>	
B-2	The TIS for the SEIR, incorrectly states that the only intersection (Caltrans' facility) that would operate at unacceptable levels of service would be Genesee Avenue/I-5 SB Ramps. The Genesee Avenue/I-5 NB ramps and SB ramp during the AM peak hour are not operating as identified in Table 4.2-7. Based on the traffic report for the Genesee widening project, Caltrans counts, previous work at this intersection, and field observations the existing LOS for this intersection is D or worse. Table 4.2-7 also shows that the delay increase for the Genesee Ave/I-5 NB ramp intersection for the PM peak hour is 22.7	
	"Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California's economy and livability"	

- 3-1 Comment noted. No further response is required.
  - The comment suggests that the I-5 NB ramp/Genesee Avenue intersection is operating at an unacceptable level of service in the AM peak hour for the existing condition. This assertion differs from what is reported in the Campus Point Master Plan SEIR and the result reported in the recently approved University Community Plan Amendment TIA, both of which indicate acceptable levels of service for that intersection in the AM peak hour and condition. Other approved environmental documents show results similar to the Campus Point Master Plan SEIR, including Scripps Memorial Hospital and University Towne Centre Revitalization Project. It is unclear why the Caltrans result differs from other approved environmental documents, which have evaluated the same intersection and condition in the recent past. It is possible that Caltrans count data differed significantly from the counts obtained in the other recent studies cited. However, the majority of data available evaluating that intersection support the result reported in the Campus Point Master Plan SEIR. Therefore, the reported level of service in the AM peak hour is correct.

Ms. Blake January 4, 2016 Page 2

B-3

2. 14.2 Direct Impact: Although the SEIR, as with the original EIR, concludes that impacts at the I-5/Genesee ramps are deferred to the current I-5/Genesee Interchange improvement project, Caltrans recommends a "Fair Share" also be considered towards an auxiliary lane project at I-5 between Genesee and La Jolla Village Drive that is planned to start construction next year, depending upon funding, which will also improve traffic operations at the I-5/Genesee Interchange. Caltrans would be willing to meet with City staff to discuss further the schedule, scope and cost for the proposed auxiliary lane project.

If you have any questions, please contact Kimberly Dodson, of the Caltrans Development Review Branch, at (619) 688-2510 or by e-mail sent to kimberly.dodson@dot.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

JACOB M. ARMSTRONG, Chief Development Review Branch

B-3

The comment suggests that the project contribute a "Fair Share" towards construction of the auxiliary lane project at I-5 between Genesee and La Jolla Village Drive, which would improve traffic operations at the I-5/Genesee Interchange. Although this improvement may improve traffic operations as suggested, the level of service for the segment of I-5 between Genesee Avenue and La Jolla Village Drive operate at acceptable levels of service as shown in Tables 1-8 thru 1-10 in Appendix C to the SEIR. Additionally, as discussed in the SEIR, it is anticipated that improvements mentioned in the comment, which are already under construction will mitigate project impacts. As these improvements are currently fully funded and under construction, the payment of an additional fair-share for a separate improvement is not recommended in the SEIR.

"Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California's economy and livability"

# Letter C

From:	Weiss, Eric@Wildlife <eric.weiss@< th=""><th>wildlife.ca.gov&gt;</th><th></th></eric.weiss@<>	wildlife.ca.gov>	
Sent:	Friday, December 30, 2016 11:33	AM	
То:	DSD EAS		
Subject:	Campus Pointe Master Plan SEIR	SCH No. 2014091073	Project No. 336364

#### Good afternoon Ms. Blake,

C-1 The Department of Fish and Wildlife (Department) has reviewed the City of San Diego's (City) Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) for the Campus Pointe Master Plan (proposed project; State Clearinghouse No. 2014091073, Project No. 336364). The proposed project would process a Community Plan amendment to the University Community Plan, a Site Development Permit, and a Neighborhood Development Permit to allow for the intensification of an existing 731,725 square-foot scientific research and development facility by 328,383 square feet for a total of 1,060,108 square-feet of development. The proposed project would include the construction of a 1.2- and 6- story, splitlevel, multi-tenant building, and a 2-story building housing a micro-brewery with accessory dining space and shared tenant amenity spaces. In addition, a 9-level (including three subterranean levels) parking structure with 1,500 parking stalls would be constructed on the 58.19-acre project site. The proposed project is located at 10290 to 10300 Campus Point Drive, at the northern terminus of Campus Point Drive north of Genesee Avenue, west of Interstate 5, and east of Roselle Street (APNS 343-230-13).

The Department offers the following comments to assist the City in avoiding and minimizing potential impacts associated with the proposed project.

- C-2 The Department recommends that the proposed project include the most current building design standards that demonstrate measures taken to minimize impacts associated with avian bird strikes and buildings. The proposed project would construct large glass-paneled structures adjacent to Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA) and habitats supporting a variety of bird species. Within the United States alone, avian mortality numbers reach hundreds of millions per years due to collisions with glass (American Bird Conservancy, Bird-Friendly Design). While Section 4.1.4.1 of the SEIR conditions the proposed project so that "...[w]indows and building materials shall not use glazing with an outdoor reflectivity greater than 55 percent in order to reduce the potential for bird strike" the Department recommends that the SEIR incorporate design elements from the American Bird Conservary (ABC) Bird-Friendly Design Guide (http://collisions.abcbirds.org/) in an effort to minimize avian collisions in proximity to preserve areas in the City. These measures include retrofitting existing buildings (e.g., CP 1 and CP 2), as well as incorporating measures specific to new construction (e.g., CP 3 and CP 4). The ABC Building Guide offers multiple solutions for reducing impacts to avian species, including recommendations that also qualify for Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) credits (ABC, 2015). ABC provides project design measures with the goal of reducing avian collisions with buildings while also being specific and enforceable (see Public Resource Code §21081.6 (c)).
- C-3 We appreciate the City including mitigation measure BIO-2, however, the SEIR's avian bird mitigation measures relies on a raptor nesting season that does not account for the earlier (e.g., January) raptor nesting activities observed in San Diego County, nor does it provide an enforceable mechanism (e.g., survey area/radius) for pre-construction avian surveys. We recommend that January 1 be used as an early raptor nesting season. While the City is granted coverage for 27 species of bird pursuant to the Implementing Agreement (IA), Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) Subarea Plan, that coverage is extended to the City so long as the Conditions of Coverage (Appendix A of the MSCP Subarea Plan) are implemented. While the species-specific Conditions of Coverage (Appendix A of the MSCP Subarea Plan) are implemented. While the species-specific Conditions of Coverage may not be a comprehensive list of all feasible avoidance and minimization measures, they are the minimum requirement of covered species pursuant to the IA. For example, for projects located within the MHPA an impact avoidance buffer of 300 feet from a Coopers hawk (*Accipiter cooperii*) nest is required. For those species not specifically granted coverage under MSCP (non-MSCP covered species; only 27 avian species are covered by the MSCP) potential impacts and thus avoidance and minimization measures must be incorporated in the CEQA document. Fish and Game Code sections 3503 and 3503.5 *et seq.* collectively prohibits the take (as defined by Fish and Game Code sections 86) of migratory birds, eggs, raptors, their nests.

1

C-1 Comment noted. No further response is required.

- C-2 The building façades incorporate multiple strategies outlined in the Bird-Friendly Design Guide by the American Bird Conservancy. The glazed façades are highly patterned incorporating frosted panels with patterned vision glass, mullion extensions and offset panels, as well as interior coated shades. The high performance glazing used will have an exterior reflectance percentage of lower than 50 percent. No evidence appears of a potentially significant impact.
- C-3 Comment noted. Only one raptor species has the potential to nest on-site: Cooper's hawk. Both Phil Unitt's Bird Atlas and the Cornell Lab of Ornithology document early egg laying for this species as late March. Thus, the nesting season identified in BIO-1 has an appropriate start date for the bird breeding season of February 1, which will allow time for this species for nest building and copulations. Additionally, the General Nesting Bird Mitigation Measure (BIO-2) is consistent with the City of San Diego Biology Guidelines and the MSCP Conditions of Coverage; it is the standard measure upon which the City relies to address potential impacts to raptors and/or any native/migratory birds. This measure would preclude direct impacts to nesting birds consistent with the federal MBTA and the California Fish and Game Code. A 300-foot impact avoidance area is also included in BIO-1, should an active Cooper's hawk nest be identified within the MHPA. Avoidance buffers for nesting bird species inside the project impact area would be determined by a Qualified Biologist depending on various factors (i.e., the avian species involved, ambient levels of human activity, and screening vegetation), per BIO-2. The discretionary permit also includes as a condition of project approval that the applicant(s) shall adhere to all state and federal laws, including the federal MBTA and the California Fish and Game Code, in particular, Section 3503.

To avoid unauthorized take of raptor species, all Conditions of Coverage must be implemented for MSCP-covered C-4 species, and appropriate avoidance and minimization measures should be incorporated into CEQA documents for non-MSCP covered species. In addition, in order to make the current SEIR's avian survey mitigation measure (Mitigation Measure BIO-1 and BIO-2) enforceable (per CEQA Guidelines section 151269a(2)) we recommend pre-construction nesting bird surveys should be performed within 300 feet of the project site for passerines and 500 feet for raptors. We recommend that the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) language for LU-1 include conditions specifying the type, structure, placement, and annual maintenance required for the storm water system in order to ensure that indirect impacts to MHPA are adequately addressed. To comply with the City's Land Use Adjacency Guidelines, the City has included Section 4.1.4.1 MHPA Land Use Adjacency and Chapter 8 of the SEIR which proposed to construct private storm drain facilities, catch basins, pipelines, and bio-filtration areas as components of the proposed project. The SEIR relies on Mitigation Measure LU-1 and the Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) permit requirements to ensure compliance with Drainage requirements of the City's MSCP Land Use Adjacency Guidelines. The Department is tasked with overseeing the implementation of the City's MSCP, including the Land Use Adjacency Guidelines; however, Mitigation Measure LU-1 does not include project-specific design measures and the specific conditions of the MS4 permit were not provided for review at part of the draft SEIR. Therefore, the Department is unable to ensure that the MSCP is being implemented as agreed upon in the MSCP IA and accordingly we recommend revisions to the MMRP that include specific conditions to facilitate the Department's review of City efforts to comply with the MSCP Land Use Adjacency Guidelines. Thank you for considering these items. Eric Weiss Senior Environmental Scientist (Specialist)

2

California Department of Fish and Wildlife South Coast Region, Habitat Conservation Planning

SaveOurWater.com · Drought.CA.gov

Every Californian should conserve water. Find out how at:

3883 Ruffin Road

San Diego, CA 92123 Phone (858) 467-4289

Save Our Water

Comment noted. The Land use Adjacency Mitigation Measure (LU-1) is consistent with the City of San Diego Biology Guidelines and the MSCP Conditions of Coverage; it is the standard measure upon which the City relies to address potential impacts to the MHPA. Mitigation Measures BIO-1 and BIO-2 would assure that a 300-foot buffer would be provided for any Cooper's hawk nest and that other birds are protected during construction. As noted in Chapter 4.1, runoff from the undeveloped portion of the site would drain either down the western slopes of the project area or into the improved storm drain system to the south, outside of the MHPA. The project would not result in a significant change to the drainage patterns on-site. Additionally, the proposed drainage system, which consists of two pump stations, an infiltration basin, and a bioretention basin, is also located outside of the MHPA. The final approved Addendum to the Storm Water Plan is included as Appendix F-2 and the Hydrology and Hydraulic Study as Appendix G.

C-4



- D-1 Comment noted. No further response is required.
  - The issue of Health and Safety/Hazardous Materials was determined to be adequately addressed in the 1993 FEIR as detailed in Section 8.2 of the SEIR. Additionally, the SEIR does disclose the results of hazardous materials database searches in Section 8.2.3. As detailed in this section, no releases of hazardous wastes/substances have been reported on-site or in the project vicinity. Based on the results of the record search, the developed nature of the project site, and the lack of any disturbance or human activity in the undeveloped portions of the project site that would have the potential to result in unauthorized releases of hazardous materials, the likelihood of hazardous wastes/substances being present on the site is low, and a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment is not warranted.
- D-3 No recognized environmental conditions have been identified on the project site as detailed in Section 8.2 of the SEIR.

Ms. Martha Blake December 6, 2016 Page 2

D-4

D-5

 If the project plans include discharging wastewater to a storm drain, you may be required to obtain an NPDES permit from the overseeing Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB).

4. If during construction/demolition of the project, soil and/or groundwater contamination is suspected, construction/demolition in the area should cease and appropriate health and safety procedures should be implemented. If it is determined that contaminated soil and/or groundwater exist, the EIR should identify how any required investigation and/or remediation will be conducted, and the appropriate government agency to provide regulatory oversight.

If you have any questions regarding this letter, please contact me at (714) 484-5476 or email at <u>Johnson.Abraham@dtsc.ca.gov</u>.

Sincerely,

Johnson P. Abraham Project Manager Brownfields Restoration and School Evaluation Branch Brownfields and Environmental Restoration Program - Cypress

kl/sh/ja

cc: See next page.

- D-4 The project has been Conditioned with the following:
  - Development of this project shall comply with all storm water construction requirements of the State Construction General Permit, Order No. 2009-0009DWQ, or subsequent order, and the Municipal Storm Water Permit, Order No. R9-2013-0001, or subsequent order. In accordance with Order No. 2009-0009DWQ, or subsequent order, a Risk Level Determination shall be calculated for the site and a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) shall be implemented concurrently with the commencement of grading activities.
  - 2. Prior to issuance of a grading or a construction permit, a copy of the Notice of Intent (NOI) with a valid Waste Discharge ID number (WDID#) shall be submitted to the City of San Diego as a proof of enrollment under the Construction General Permit. When ownership of the entire site or portions of the site changes prior to filing of the Notice of Termination (NOT), a revised NOI shall be submitted electronically to the State Water Resources Board in accordance with the provisions as set forth in Section II.C of Order No. 2009-0009-DWQ and a copy shall be submitted to the City.

D-5 The project has been Conditioned to obtain a bonded grading permit for the grading proposed for this project. All grading shall conform to the requirements of the City of San Diego Municipal Code in a manner satisfactory to the City Engineer. The Grading Permit Improvement Plans must include the City of San Diego Standard Ground Water Discharge Notes that clearly note how any ground water encountered shall be addressed.

RESPONSE

Decer	lartha Blake nber 6, 2016 2	
Page	3	
cc:	Governor's Office of Planning and Research (via e-mail) State Clearinghouse P.O. Box 3044 Sacramento, California 95812-3044 <u>State.clearinghouse@opr.ca.gov</u>	
	Mr. Guenther W. Moskat, Chief (via e-mail) Planning and Environmental Analysis Section CEQA Tracking Center Department of Toxic Substances Control <u>Guenther.Moskat@dtsc.ca.gov</u>	
	Mr. Dave Kereazis (via e-mail) Office of Planning & Environmental Analysis Department of Toxic Substances Control <u>Dave.Kereazis@dtsc.ca.gov</u>	
	Mr. Shahir Haddad, Chief (via e-mail) Schools Evaluation and Brownfields Cleanup Brownfields and Environmental Restoration Program - Cypress <u>Shahir Haddad@dtsc.ca.gov</u>	
	CEQA# 2014091073	



RTC-10

#### E-1 Comment noted

- Comment noted. As discussed in Appendix C to the SEIR, no trip generation reductions or credits were applied for Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures. The Campus Point Master Plan project is not relying on TDM to mitigate traffic impacts from the project. As discussed in Section 16.0 of Appendix C to the SEIR, TDM measures are intended to further reduce project trips as an additional benefit and in an effort to contribute to Community Plan conformance. Therefore, this comment does not affect any conclusion of the SEIR regarding any impacts to transportation. However, changes to the TDM Plan have been made responsive to MTS comments and requests as discussed in responses to comments below. These changes will assist in "closing the gap" and directly addressing the "last mile" issue raised in this comment.
- Comment noted. This comment does not affect any conclusion of the EIR regarding any impacts to transportation. However, changes to the TDM Plan have been made responsive to MTS comments and requests as discussed in responses to comments below. These changes will assist in providing greater frequency service and reducing the inconvenience for the rider as discussed in the comment.

#### MTS COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT SEIR

	SEIR LOCATION/LANGUAGE	MTS COMMENTS
4	Page 3-20 (Section 3.3.5, Transportation Demand Management)	Please see detailed comments below on Appendix C, Section 16.
5	Page 3-24 (Section 3.3.8, Environmental Design Considerations):"In order to achieve LEED Silver certification, the project would need to earn 50 to 59 points by incorporating additional design features in the above categories, plus location and transportation (access to quality transit,"	The LEED "Access to quality transit" category requires a maximum ½ mile walking distance from rapid transit. MTS presumes the one mile distance to transit makes the project ineligible for LEED points in this category. This is seemingly acknowledged in the SEIR Appendix C (Page 13-2): "No trip reductions for transit service were assumed as part of this analysis."
5	Page 3-26 (Section 3.5, History of Project Changes): "These additional measures included reducing parking to the minimum allowed by the City of San Diego Municipal Code"	This contradicts information elsewhere in the SEIR that the project buildout will include more parking than required (2.74 spaces/1,000 SF, versus the minimum 2.50 spaces/1,000 SF) (Appendix C, Page 1-2).
7	Page 4.1-30, Table 4.1-1 (University Community Plan, Community Goals, Row i, <u>Transportation Goals</u> ): Applicable Land Use Plans Goals and Objectives: "Encourage alternative modes of transportation by requiring developer participation in transit facility improvements, the Intra-Community Shuttle Loop and the Light Rail Transit (LRT) system." "The project would include a transportation demand management (TDM) program that would encourage alternative modes of transportation. The program would include bike lockers, showers, shuttle system to local transit centers, discounted transit passes and a bike share program. Refer to Section 3.2.5 for additional details."	As stated previously, the Intra-Community Shuttle Loop (now in operation as <i>Rapid</i> SuperLoop Routes 201/202 and 204) and the LRT (Mid-Coast extension) are too far from the project site to be impactful. Please see comments below regarding the proposed TDM measures and shuttle service. The reference to Section 3.2.5 appears to be an error, as this information is included in Section 3.3.5.
8	Page 4.1-36, Table 4.1-1 (University Community Plan, Transportation Element, Rows a-C): a. Provide a network of transportation systems that are integrated, complementary and compatible with other citywide and regional goals. The network should take into account the physical, social, economic and environmental conditions of the community, both present and future. "The project would provide mitigation for traffic impacts except the project's significant impacts to the 1-5/Genesee Avenue interchange (Impact-TR-3 and Impact TR-4) that would be temporarily unmitigated until Caltrans completes its planned, fully funded and under construction 1-5/ Genesee Avenue Interchange project in fall 2017. These improvements are out of the control of the applicant. Therefore, the project would not conflict with this goal. Refer to Section 4.2 for additional details." b. Provide a balanced public transportation system to link the entire community to all of its own activity areas and to the San Diego metropolitan area as a whole. "The project would include a TDM program to promote a balanced and linked transportation system. Refer to Section 3.2.5 for additional details."	Row a: The SEIR addresses specific traffic impacts and mitigation; it does not holistically discuss the overall transportation network as suggested in the Transportation Element. Row b: Please see detailed comments below on Appendix C, Section 16. Row c: As stated previously, the Intra- Community Shuttle Loop (now in operation as <i>Rapid</i> SuperLoop Routes 201/202 and 204) and the LRT (Mid-Coast extension) are too far from the project site to be impactful. Please see Appendix C comments below regarding the proposed shuttle service and TDM measures. The two references to Section 3.2.5 appear to be errors, as this information is included in Section 3.3.5.
	Ms. Martha Bla	Page 2 ke, Environmental Planner, City of San Diego

- E-4 This comment refers to more detailed comments that follow (numbered E-5 through E-25); no further response is necessary.
- E-5 LEED point(s) for 'access to quality transit' is not achievable until such time, as future transit lines are routed to within one-half a mile from the site.
- E-6 Comment noted. The referenced text in Section 3.5 has been modified to read, "These additional measures included reducing parking toward the minimum required by the City of San Diego Municipal Code."
- E-7 This comment references a subsequent comment, numbered E-16. The reference to Section 3.2.5 has been corrected.
- E-8 This comment references a subsequent comment, numbered E-16. The reference to Section 3.2.5 has been corrected.

E-9	c. Encourage alternative modes of transportation by requiring developer participation in transit facility improvements, the Intra-Community Shuttle Loop and the LRT line. "The project would include a TDM program that promotes transit use and includes a private shuttle to the UTC and Sorrento Valley transit centers. Refer to Section 3.3.5 for additional details." Page 4.1-40, Table 4.1-1: (City of San Diego General Plan,	The SEIR itself suggests that the project	E-9	Comment noted. This comment references a subsequent comment, which is addressed in response numbered E-16.
	Mobility Element, Row B – Transit): • Increased Transit Ridership "The project would include a TDM program to promote alternative transportation, including transit use. The program would include a shuttle system to the UTC and Sorrento Valley transit centers and 25 percent discounted transit passes."	won't likely increase transit ridership: "No trip reductions for transit service were assumed as part of this analysis." (Appendix C, Page 13-2.) See MTS comments below on Appendix C regarding the proposed shuttle service and discounted transit passes.	F 10	
E-10	<ul> <li>Page 4.1-41, Table 4.1-1: (City of San Diego General Plan, Mobility Element, Row E – Transportation Demand Management):</li> <li>Reduced single-occupant vehicular traffic on congested streets and freeways.</li> <li>Expanded travel options and improved personal mobility.</li> <li>"The project would include a TDM program to promote alternative transportation. The program would include carpooling incentives, carpooling priority parking, carpooling association, bike lockers, showers, shuttle system to UTC and Sorrento Valley transit centers, 25 percent discounted transit passes and a bike share program."</li> </ul>	See MTS comments below on Appendix C regarding the proposed shuttle service and TDM program.	E-10	Comment noted. This comment references a subsequent comment, which is addressed in response numbered E-16.
E-11	<ul> <li>Page 4.1-50, Table 4.1-1: (City of San Diego General Plan, Conservation Element, Row A – Climate Change and Sustainable Development):</li> <li>To reduce the City's overall carbon dioxide footprint by improving energy efficiency, increasing use of alternative modes of transportation, employing sustainable planning and design techniques, and providing environmentally sound waste management.</li> <li>"The project would also include a TDM program to increase alternative modes of transportation, as detailed in Section 3.3.5."</li> </ul>	See MTS comments below on Appendix C regarding the proposed TDM program.	E-11	Comment noted. This comment references a subsequent comment, which is addressed in response numbered E-16.
E-12	Page 4.2-28 (Section 4.2.4.1, Impacts): "While the project would include a TDM Program, it is not feasible for the City or applicant to control employees' transportation choices to guarantee that peak hour trips would be reduced to the equivalent of an 18,000 sf/ac development required by the UCP." "this impact would be avoided through the proposed community plan amendment and no significant impacts would occur."	MTS suggests that transportation choices are heavily influenced by incentives and disincentives that could be within the control of the developer and/or the City. No evident disincentives are being proposed to mitigate increased traffic (parking charges, limited parking availability, etc.), and MTS finds significant issues with the proposed incentives (the TDM program) as addressed below in this letter. MTS recommends that the City consider "lowering the bar" through a Community Plan Amendment only if all possible proven incentives and disincentives are implemented as mitigation in conjunction with the amendment.	E-12	Please refer to response to comments E-2, E-16, and E-18.
	Ms. Martha Bla	Page 3 ake, Environmental Planner, City of San Diego December 30, 2016		

E-13	Page 4.2-32 (Section 4.2.7.1, Impacts): E	See MTS comments below on Appendix C regarding the proposed shuttle service and TDM Program. Note that in Section 3.3.5 and Appendix C, the shuttle is limited in scope and triggered by an occupancy level and the success of other TDM measures. MTS has concerns with the monitoring and permanence of the TDM measures. The reference to Section 3.2.5 appears to be an error, as this information is included in	
E-14	Page 4.2-32 (Section 4.2.7.2, Significance "Impacts to alternative modes of transport than significant."		Section 3.3.5. MTS notes that it has substantial bus service in the University City area, including along streets which will be impacted by project- generated traffic increases. To the extent that any delay is added to the system, this increases transit travel times and MTS' operating costs unless mitigated by bus priority measures like bus lanes or queue jumpers. None are proposed as part of this project. Additionally, MTS is responsible for operating Americans with Disabilities Act complementary paratransit service ("MTS Access") to this area. Project employees and visitors who are unable to access the site from fixed-route transit service a mile away due to a qualifying disability may be eligible to use MTS Access for the trip. These are the most expensive and highly subsidized trips that MTS operates, so we would anticipate the potential for a direct budget liverset to MTS
	MTS COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT S	SEIR, APPENDIX C,	impact to MTS. SECTION 13 (TRANSIT AND OTHER
	MODES):		
E-15 E-16	SEIR LANGUAGE "The applicant will provide a shuttle system upon project occupancy of 75%. The shuttle will connect the Campus Pointe property with the University Towne Center transit center and the Sorrento Valley Transit Center. The planned system will consist of one 10 passenger van with 30 minute headways during the AM and PM peak hours. The shuttle will operate with 30 minute headways between the peak hours 7:00 am- 9:00am and 4:00 pm-6:00pm. During off-peak hours of 9:00am to 4:00pm, the shuttle will operate with 1 hour headways."	contradicted in Section provided <u>only if</u> stands SEIR should clarify the TDM goal achievemen MTS recommends that by initial occupancy (a Commute habits beco when employees begin shift to transit later. Ad existing employees will shuttle operation. The proposed shuttle of low to make a substan	t the implementation be triggered immediately nd that "occupancy" is clearly defined). me ingrained early; if the shuttle is not available n occupying the project, they are less likely to ditionally, there are a significant number of thin the development that can benefit from a capacity compared to the project scope is too tive difference in traffic or air quality. A 10- irrating twice an hour can handle a maximum of
		Ms. Martha B	Page 4 lake, Environmental Planner, City of San Diego December 30, 2016

- E-13 Comment noted. This comment references a subsequent comment which is addressed in response to comments E-15, E-16, ad E-17. The reference to Section 3.2.5 has been corrected.
- E-14 MTS' budgetary concern is not a CEQA concern because it has no foreseeable significant impact on the physical environment. In addition, please refer to response to comment E-16.
- E-15 Consistent with MTS' request, the occupancy trigger has been removed from the TDM program and all TDM measures will be implemented upon certificate of occupancy for CP3 with occupancy by tenants. Again, the project does not rely on TDM to mitigate traffic impacts.
- E-16 The proposed TDM condition for a shuttle has been amended to provide an alternative option to the shuttle responsive to this comment. The alternative option will provide employee access to a rideshare service such as Uber or Lyft at no cost to the employee when accessed and utilized within a 2-mile radius of the Campus Point Master Plan project. This type of service will provide demand-responsive and scalable service convenient to employees within the Campus Point Master Plan area. This service would also provide wheelchair-accessible vehicles. Since the service is scalable, it can handle any amount of demand and would not be limited to the 10-passenger vehicle provided by the shuttle option. In addition, the rideshare option would provide a much higher frequency of service as requested. Again, the project does not rely on TDM to mitigate traffic impacts.

			E-
		20 riders per hour per direction, less than 1.5% of the 1,347 A.M. peak hour trips estimated on Campus Point Drive. Based on our experience with the Sorrento Valley COASTER Connection, plus adding the future frequent light rail connection on the Trolley, we estimate that the demand could be much higher than the proposed shuttle would accommodate. MTS would suggest larger, wheelchair-accessible vehicles, operating a minimum 15-minute headway throughout the day to match the frequencies on many area bus services and the (future) light rail.	
E-17		<ul> <li>The UTC Transit Center may lack the capacity to accommodate the shuttle, and there are two stations on the Mid-Coast light rail extension that are closer to the project site: Voigt Drive and Executive Drive. In anticipation that a better transfer alternative may exist, MTS recommends that the shuttle specification be adjusted, from "the University Towne Center Transit Center" to, "the UTC Transit Center area <u>or</u> another station along the Mid-Coast light rail extension, to be determined upon implementation in consultation with MTS."</li> </ul>	E-1
	MTS has two overall concerns wit	FT SEIR, APPENDIX C, SECTION 16 (TDM): th the Transportation Demand Management (TDM) section: implementation, and on-going maintenance of the TDM strategies; are voluntary to tenants and offer very few components that have where.	
	SEIR LANGUAGE	MTS COMMENTS	
E-18	"The following TDM measures will be monitored for a period of five years following the occupancy of 75% of the project. A monitoring	<ul> <li>It is unclear what is to happen beyond the five year horizon. Do the applicant's responsibilities for TDM sunset? If not, how are their efforts monitored after five years, who monitors them, and what are the implications if they are not effective?</li> </ul>	
E-19	report including a discussion of TDM measures which have been implemented and a determination of the effectiveness of the combined TDM measures will be	<ul> <li>A key challenge with a specific trigger for advanced TDM strategies (such as the shuttle implementation) is, what occurs if and when the TDM goals are met? Will the shuttle and other programs be suddenly eliminated, thereby shifting transit commuters back into cars?</li> </ul>	
E-20	prepared and provided to the City of San Diego each year for five years."	<ul> <li>MTS recommends that the shuttle (and perhaps other TDM measures) be specified as an indefinite requirement of project occupancy.</li> </ul>	
	"Carpool Association" "Coordinate and request tenants of the new buildings offer transit	These measures all appear to be voluntary programs that tenants would opt-in to. The applicant's only requirement would be to suggest or request participation, which is likely to limit efficacy.	
E-21	passes for their employees at a 25% discount." "Offer a bikeshare program to employees of tenants in the new buildings" "Encourage participation in the SANDAG iCommute program or equivalent"	What is the reasoning behind the 25% discount that would be requested of project tenants to provide for transit passes? Since the applicant is not suggesting covering this cost as part of the project, MTS would recommend that passes be subsidized at the highest level possible to encourage participation. A higher level of discount, or even a fully subsidized pass, would result in a more successful program.	
E-22	"There will be an incentive program for carpool and off-peak travelers which may consist of a credit voucher to eat at the onsite restaurant or other incentives."	The lack of specificity on incentives ("or other incentives") essentially relieves the applicant of any material requirement.	

Page 5 Ms. Martha Blake, Environmental Planner, City of San Diego December 30, 2016

- -17 As requested, in previous comments, an alternative to the shuttle option has been provided (see response to comment E-6). With the rideshare service option, all of the destinations discussed in the comment would be reachable. As the rideshare service would be user directed, any station would be reachable although coordination with MTS would not be possible. Again, the project does not rely on TDM to mitigate traffic impacts.
- The comment notes to overall concerns including ambiguity over 8 the monitoring, implementation and ongoing maintenance as well as that most strategies are voluntary to tenants. In order to address these two concerns, the 75 percent occupancy threshold has been removed to ensure quicker and smoother implementation. In addition, ongoing maintenance of each TDM condition will be a requirement of the project through conditions of approval. However, some flexibility in monitoring and implementation is required in order to adjust the TDM measures based on the findings of monitoring studies. As mentioned in the TDM plan, a target has been established for TDM effectiveness and measures are intended to be adjusted based on tenant and employee reaction to the application of various TDM measures. Since the TDM will be applied to the future development as well as existing buildings and tenants, which already have signed leases, some TDM measures may be implemented over time to meet the conditions of applicable contracts. It is anticipated that all TDM measures will be implemented over time as new leases are negotiated for existing buildings.

The applicant's responsibilities for TDM will continue beyond five years and will not terminate. The monitoring is intended to supply information enabling adjustment and fine-tuning of the TDM program and will be completed within five years of occupancy as discussed in Appendix C, Section 16. The TDM measures will be implemented as conditions of approval and the City has remedies if they are discontinued in the future. Again, the project does not rely on TDM to mitigate traffic impacts.

E-19	The TDM plan has been updated to remove the "advanced TDM strategies" as well as the 75 percent occupancy threshold. All TDM strategies will be applied as discussed in the TDM plan with tenant occupancy of CP3. Within the five-year initial implementation of the TDM Plan, support for various plan elements may be increased if TDM performance targets are not achieved. None of the TDM conditions will be eliminated. Again, the project does not rely on TDM to mitigate traffic impacts.
E-20	The shuttle and all other TDM measures would be included in the conditions of approval and would be a permanent requirement of the project upon tenant occupancy of CP3. Again, the project does not rely on TDM to mitigate traffic impacts.
E-21	Carpool association comment, see response to comments E-8 through E-11. The 25 percent transit subsidy will be provided by either the applicant or the tenant and will provide transit passes to qualified employees at a minimum price reduction of 25 percent to the standard price advertised on the MTS website. Higher subsidies may be considered if TDM performance targets are not achieved at the option of the applicant. Again, the project does not rely on TDM to mitigate traffic impacts.
E-22	The lack of specificity regarding incentives is intended to provide flexibility in implementing this condition to find the proper incentive, which appeals to the greatest number of employees. Examples of incentives, which may be provided, are discussed in Appendix C, Section 16. Incentives may be adjusted if TDM performance targets are not achieved at the option of the applicant. Again, the project does not rely on TDM to mitigate traffic impacts.

E-23	*Alternative compliance at the sole option of the property owner       It is unclear what this option is an alternative to. Would implementing the alternative compliance relieve the applicant of all TDM requirements, just the advanced TDM measures, or something different altogether? While Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) can be positive advancements, our concern is that these do not necessarily reduce vehicle miles or solo car commuters, which is a central goal of TDM. ITS may be a suitable alternative for other types of traffic mitigation, but not necessarily for reducing overall traffic demand.         Additionally, implementation of ITS measures could require an operational budget for on-going monitoring and maintenance (presumably by the City), though funding for such is not mentioned in the SEIR.         At a minimum, MTS would suggest that the City (rather than the property	
	owner) determine whether alternate measures would be more effective for traffic mitigation and climate change goals than the TDM measures.           MTS suggests that the project include a stable, reliable, and permanent TDM program with robust	
	incentives and disincentives for maximum efficacy. Some elements could include:	
E-24	<ul> <li>Free transit passes: MTS offers an EcoPass program that discounts bulk pass purchases by as much as 25%. Offering these at no cost to site employees, subsidized by the property owner, would provide a strong incentive to use transit and could reduce the amount of parking that must be constructed.</li> </ul>	
E-25	<ul> <li>Shuttle service: As suggested in the SEIR, but with modifications on vehicles, headways, and stations as recommended in our comments above. As previously stated, a shuttle should be</li> </ul>	
E-26	<ul> <li>a permanent project condition, without a sunset or TDM participation trigger.</li> <li>Parking charges: transit is most successful in areas like Downtown San Diego, where the</li> </ul>	
E-20	parking supply is restricted and expensive. This project proposes nearly three thousand spaces (2.74/1,000 SF, higher than the stated minimum 2.50/1,000 SF), so charging for	
	parking may be the easiest disincentive readily available. Such parking charges could provide an on-going source of revenue to help fund the shuttle and other TDM measures.	Ι.
	Thank you again for the opportunity to comment on this project.	
	Sincerely,	Ι.
	Denis Desmond	
	Manager of Planning	
	L-CAMPUSPOINTEMASTERPLAN.SEIR.BLAKE.DDESMOND.123016	
	cc: Sharon Cooney, Mark Thomsen, Katie Hentrich (SANDAG), Coleen Clementson (SANDAG)	
	Page 6	
	Ms. Martha Blake, Environmental Planner, City of San Diego December 30, 2016	

- E-23 The alternative compliance option to the TDM program has been removed from the program. Please refer to the updated Appendix C, Section 16. The TDM measures discussed in the TDM plan will be implemented as conditions of approval and will be permanent. Again, the project does not rely on TDM to mitigate traffic impacts.
- E-24 Comment noted. Participation in the EcoPass program is being considered for the Campus Point Master Plan project. Additional or alternative transit subsidies may also be considered if TDM performance targets are not achieved at the option of the applicant. Again, the project does not rely on TDM to mitigate traffic impacts.
- E-25 Please refer to response to comments E-16 and E-18.
- E-26 Comment noted.



		Letter G		
	SANDAG			
	401 B Street, Suite 800 San Diego, CA 92101-4231 (619) 699-1900	January 5, 2017 File Number 3300300		
	Fax (619) 699-1905 səndag.org	Ms. Martha Blake City of San Diego Development Services Center 1222 First Avenue, MS 501 San Diego, CA 92101		
	MEMBER AGENCIES Cities of Carlsbad	Dear Ms. Blake:		
G-1	Chula Vista Coronado Del Mar El Cajon Encinitas	SUBJECT: Campus Point Master Plan (Project No. 336364) Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Campus Point Master Plan Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (SEIR). The San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) is submitting comments based on the	G-1	Comment noted. This introductory comment is expanded further in the comments that follow and applicable responses are provided
	Escondido Imperial Beach La Mesa Lemon Grove National City Oceanside	policies included in San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan. These policies will help provide people with more travel and housing choices, protect the environment, create healthy communities, and stimulate economic growth. SANDAG's comments are submitted from a regional perspective, emphasizing the need for better land use and transportation coordination.		below.
	Poway San Diego San Marcos Santee Solana Beach Vista and	The proposed development is not in close proximity to existing or planned transit. Significant investments in transit have been made in the University Community Plan area (e.g., <i>Rapid</i> service and the Mid-Coast Trolley), and incorporating transportation demand management (TDM) strategies into the Campus Point Master Plan SEIR would complement these investments.		
G-2	County of San Diego	Please consider the following TDM strategies for the Campus Point Master Plan SEIR:		
	ADVISORY MEMBERS Imperial County California Department of Transportation	<ul> <li>In addition to the proposed bikeshare program, consider partnering with a carshare service provider (like Zipcar) to offer carshare vehicles on-site for tenants as a convenient alternative to the private automobile.</li> </ul>	G-2	Comment noted. Please refer to response to comment E-16.
	Metropolitan Transit System North County Transit District	<ul> <li>In addition to providing designated parking for carpools and vanpools, consider parking management strategies, such as shared parking, priced parking, and parking cash-out.</li> </ul>		
	United States Department of Defense San Diego	<ul> <li>As an alternative to static bulletin boards for transportation information, consider providing real-time trip planning kiosks (like TransitScreen) in central locations to encourage alternative transportation programs.</li> </ul>		
	Unified Port District San Diego County Water Authority	<ul> <li>Consider partnering with an on-demand rideshare service as a flexible and cost-effective alternative to the proposed fixed route shuttle system. Both Uber and Lyft provide on-demand services for businesses and can provide</li> </ul>		
	Southern California Tribal Chairmen's Association Mexico	connections to and from transit (i.e., the COASTER and the future Mid-Coast Trolley station).		

		1	
	Additionally, new tenants could partner with the SANDAG TDM Program, iCommute, to take advantage of regional TDM programs and services. This includes the SANDAG Vanpool Program, online ridematching services, and the Guaranteed Ride Home Program. Further, the iCommute Employer Services Program can work with new tenants to develop a customized commuter benefit program that promotes viable transportation alternatives to employees. Information on these programs can be accessed through iCommuteSD.com.		
G-3	Lastly, throughout the Campus Point Master Plan SEIR, please update all references from RideLink to iCommute.	G-3	The SEIR has been revised to update all references from Ridelink to iCommute.
	Other Considerations		
G-4	Recognizing that lower parking rates can reinforce lower vehicle trip generation rates and encourage travel by transit, bike, or foot, SANDAG created a Regional Parking Management Toolbox. The Toolbox provides parking management strategies, such as shared parking, that could assist the project in providing sufficient parking without exceeding established parking standards.	G-4	Comment noted.
	SANDAG has a number of additional resources that can be used for additional information or clarification on topics discussed in this letter. These can be found on our website at sandag.org/igr:		
	1. Riding to 2050, the San Diego Regional Bike Plan		
	<ol> <li>Regional Multimodal Transportation Analysis: Alternative Approaches for Preparing Multimodal Transportation Analysis in Environmental Impact Reports</li> </ol>		
	3. Planning and Designing for Pedestrians, Model Guidelines for the San Diego Region		
G-5	SANDAG encourages the City to coordinate with Caltrans in order to address potential impacts to Interstate 5, and to coordinate with the San Diego Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) on impacts and access to transit. SANDAG staff are also available to meet with the City, Caltrans, and MTS to discuss any comments in this letter in further detail.	G-5	Comment noted. Please refer to response to comment E-16.
G-6	When available, please send any additional environmental documents related to this project to:	G-6	Additional environmental documents related to this project shall
	Intergovernmental Review c/o SANDAG 401 B Street, Suite 800 San Diego, CA 92101		be provided to SANDAG as applicable.
	We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the Campus Point Master Plan Draft SEIR. If you have any questions, please contact me at (619) 699-1944 or via email at coleen.clementson@sandag.org.		
	Sincerely,		
	COLEEN CLEMENTSON Principal Regional Planner		
	CCL/KHE/hbr		
	2		



Comment noted. The project's treatment of historical resources is not based solely on the 1978 findings. Section 4.4 Historical Resources of the SEIR summarizes the findings of the 1993 FEIR, which states that the CA-SDI-5613 site was salvaged in 1978 and the remnants were subsequently graded and eliminated. Since the 1978 report and findings (CA-SDI-5613) were discovered and destroyed prior to the original 1993 FEIR, there is no nexus for requiring the current project applicant to curate the 1978 collection, as identification of those resources were not part of the project or existing condition analyzed in the original 1993 FEIR. However, the SEIR recognizes that there may still be buried cultural resources on-site that could be impacted during site excavations. The project would implement mitigation measure HIST-1 to ensure potential impacts would be reduced to less than significant. Further, RECON continues to store the 1978 collection as required by law.

I-2 Comment noted. Appendix E of the SEIR includes a synthesis of the findings of the 1978 report (Hanna 1978) based on the South Coastal Information Center site form for CA-SDI-5613 and personal communication with one of the report preparers (Charles Bull), as the full report could not be located. Appendix E also details the findings of the ASM Affiliates report (Schaefer et al. 2000). Results of these reports, in addition to the current RECON 2016 report are adequately disclosed in the SEIR.

	Letter I	I-1	Comment noted. This introductory comment is expanded further in the comments that follow and applicable responses are provided below.
	Martha Blake Development Services Department		
I-1	City of San Diego 10 January 2017 <u>Re: Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Report</u> <u>Campus Point Master Plan, Project No. 336364</u> Dear Ms. Blake: The University Community Planning group appreciates the opportunity to comment on this document. We have concluded that: • The draft SEIR is inadequate and should be re-circulated • The only reasonable project that should be built under the current circumstances is the Reduced Project Alternative, which requires no Community Plan Amendment Below we discuss the points that led to this conclusion.	1-2	Comment noted. Chapter 3 of the SEIR explains in detail the history of prior development plans and environmental documents for the project site. While the 1997 Addendum evaluated a reduced project scope compared to the 1993 FEIR, the more comprehensive project evaluated in the 1993 EIR is the basis from which the current project is evaluated, consistent with CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162 and 15163. Each analysis section in Chapter 4 of the SEIR analyzes the current project as compared to the existing conditions and includes a "Comparison to the 1993 FEIR" discussion at the end
I-2	<ul> <li>A. General comments on the SEIR</li> <li>This supplemental document does not thoroughly address the actual project in the context of the existing conditions and the history of the past plans for this site, leading to confusion over what the actual project impacts are: The 1993 EIR was followed by an addendum in 1997 that reduced and subdivided the project, resulting in a project to new build one building (CP2 in current project). The resulting substantially reduced project eliminated many impacts, and did not require a Community Plan Amendment; but that is not the case for the current proposal.</li> </ul>		of each section that describes how the current project impacts compare to the impacts disclosed in the 1993 FEIR and discusses how the current project would implement applicable mitigation measures from the 1993 FEIR. The City in its independent judgment concludes that the 1993 FEIR still retains value as a basis for analysis.
I-3	2. This EIR identifies potential significant impacts to Land Use, Transportation, Biological Resources, Historical Resources, and Paleontological Resources. It omits Air Quality and any discussion of Climate impacts (i.e. Greenhouse Gases); the GHG - Climate Action plan checklist was not made available to the public, who won't be able to address it until public		
1-4	hearings. It should be included with the recirculated SEIR. The current master plan for Campus Point was presented to the public <u>after</u> the finalization of the city's climate action checklist. The Executive Summary does not include the impacts to Community Character,	I-3	Air quality is addressed in Section 8.5 of the SEIR and analyzed in a technical analysis included as Appendix I of the SEIR. As detailed in
I-5 I-6	<ul> <li>which are discussed in the body.</li> <li>3. The following are missing from Draft SEIR disc and not posted on the City's website: <ol> <li>Appendix O: Community Plan – Figure 26, Table 3 and Industrial Element Excerpt</li> </ol> </li> </ul>		Section 8.5 and Appendix I, the project would reduce air quality impacts compared to what was disclosed in the 1993 FEIR.
I-7	<ol> <li>Appendix P: 1993 EIR Excerpts</li> <li>1997 Addendum to EIR No. 91-0360 (1993 Final EIR)</li> <li>B. General comments on the project</li> <li>The new project increases the development intensity relative to the 1997 amended project and and does not meet the University community plan (UCP), even with their proposed TDMs. The 1997 project proposed one 4-story building, in keeping with the community character and vision for the area; the current proposal is for a split-level building of 6 and 12 stories and a 2-story building with dining space and a microbrewery and tenant amenity spaces.</li> </ol>	1-4	The courts have consistently held that the issue of greenhouse gas emissions and climate change is not considered "new information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified" [CEQA Guidelines 15162(a)(3)] because the issue was well known at the time. Thus, as the project is within the scope of what was previously analyzed in the 1993
			FEIR, additional analysis of greenhouse gas emissions and climate change within the SEIR is not required.

I-4 (cont.)
Additionally, regarding the City's CAP checklist, the project application was in process with the City prior to approval of the CAP checklist. Thus, the project applicant was not required to complete the CAP checklist or comply with its provisions under the City's pipeline policy. Nonetheless, now that the CAP checklist is available for use, the project applicant has completed the CAP checklist, provided it to the City and has agreed to comply with applicable project conditions that would be applied to demonstrate consistency with the City's CAP.
I-5 Comment noted. Neighborhood character is addressed as Issue 2 in the Visual Quality/Neighborhood Character section of the SEIR. The purpose of the Executive Summary is to provide a brief overview of the SEIR and not to repeat every impact discussion in the body of the SEIR.
I-6 Comment noted. The SEIR did not include an Appendix O or an Appendix P; thus, those were not posted on the City's website. Additionally, the 1997 Addendum to EIR No. 91-0360 (1993 Final EIR) was not posted on the website as it is not a requirement to circulate prior environmental documents with a SEIR (CEQA Guidelines 15163(d)). What is required, which the SEIR performed, was to identify where those earlier documents are available. In addition, the applicant had sent copies of prior documents to the planning group.
I-7 Comment noted. Refer to response to comment I-2.

I-8

1-9

#### C. Land Use

1-8

1-9

I-11

I-12

I-13

- Any TDM that is implemented needs to have much more stringent conditions of oversight and penalties for failures to achieve goals, and monitoring should exceed the 5 years proposed; in fact, should continue in perpetuity. The Draft SEIR states (P. 15-1) "development of up to 30,000 SF/AC with a scientific research use would be allowable with a Transportation Systems Management plan as mitigation." This is not accurate, as it implies there is no required level to which ADT must be reduced. The Community Plan (p. 167) states these properties "shall be required to mitigate their peak hour trip generation rate to a level equal to or less than that generated by a project of 18,000 SF/AC. Mitigation shall be achieved through a Transportation System Management (TSM) program to be approved by the City Council."
  - Currently, along Campus Point Drive many buildings are either vacant or not fully occupied. The analysis of the traffic study in the SEIR needs to explain how these conditions are incorporated into the study and how they affect its projections and conclusions regarding impacts.
- I-10 3. UCSD is proposing to increase their campus population by 25-30% by the year 2035. The associated impacts and data need to be included in the cumulative impacts of the traffic section. Analysis should include how traffic from Campus Point traffic will be affected by, and could be mitigated through, coordination with the Voigt Drive changes to be built by Caltrans.
  - 4. We are also concerned that future additional development will be proposed for the site currently city-owned at the north terminus of Campus Pointe Drive. Four acres of the 42 acre site have been deemed buildable by the city of San Diego, that has sought to sell it, over the objections of the University Community.
  - The Project's distance from existing and future planned Public Transit, the inadequate proposed TDM Program, and the lack of bikeability to the site mean that the Project fails to meet one of its major goals:

"Use the site in a way that would contribute to regional goals to reduce vehicle use and promote alternative transportation use by providing a facility within a convenient distance of present and future alternative transportation facilities. (3-2)

Note: the project is .75 mile away from a single limited bus line, which operates only at peak hours and only goes to the UTC Transit Center and the Sorrento Valley Coaster Station. The project will be one mile from the nearest Midcoast trolley station. Thus the Project is only "within a convenient distance of present and future alternative transportation facilities" if there is a shuttle system operating from the date of certificate of occupancy. Plus, Campus Point Drive has only Class III bike facilities (sharrows).

The SEIR should be revised to address this shortcoming.

 As stated on DEIR p. 2-8, the University Community Plan on Table 3, footnote 3, development at this site:

> "shall be required to mitigate their peak-hour trip generation rate to a level equal to or less than that which would be generated by a project of 18,000 sf/ac. Mitigation shall be achieved through a Transportation System Management (TSM) program to be approved by the City Council."

The project proposes TDM to reduce single occupant vehicle trips during the AM and PM peak weekday hours. Section 3.3.5 of the SEIR identifies the measures that would be implemented to encourage transportation modes other than cars and reducing peak hour trips. The comment refers to a quote on page 15-1; however, this page does not exist in the SEIR. The SEIR recognizes (in SEIR Sections 3.4.1, 4.1.3, and 4.2.4.1) that "while the project would include a TDM Program, it is not feasible for the City or applicant to control employees' transportation choices to guarantee that peak hour trips would be reduced to the equivalent of an 18,000 sf/ac development required by the UCP. Thus, the project would not be consistent with the UCP's requirement to mitigate trip generation to a level equivalent to an 18,000 sf/ac project. Since the UCP policy is not practically feasible to implement, the project includes a Community Plan Amendment (CPA) to remove the requirement to "mitigate its peak hour trip generation rate to a level equal to or less than which would be generated by a project of 18,000 sf/ac."

As noted, vacancy rates in any development can vary. Therefore, traffic conditions may fluctuate seasonally or on a yearly basis for a variety of reasons. The existing condition evaluated in the traffic study was based on counts from September 2012, which represents data current when environmental analysis commenced. Subsequent conditions representing "opening day" and Year 2035 were also evaluated. These conditions estimate traffic conditions as projects under construction are occupied subsequent to the 2012 existing conditions. The traffic forecast modeling completed for the project and discussed on page 10-1 of the traffic study estimates future conditions showing a typical occupancy scenario along with construction of other projects consistent with the UCP and City of San Diego General Plan. These forecasted Year 2035 conditions show increased traffic over the 2012 existing condition and the "opening day" Year 2017 conditions. This increased traffic would account for decreased vacancies more typical for the area.

2

I-10	Traffic growth for the UCSD expansion planned at the time the traffic study was completed is included either in the "opening day" condition or in the SANDAG traffic modeling completed for the project. For example, the UCSD East Campus Bed Tower is identified as an "other project" on page 7-2 of the traffic study. In addition, growth for the UCSD campus is included in the 2035 model conditions consistent with SANDAG regional traffic model assumption. Additional growth for the UCSD campus beyond what was planned at the time the traffic study was completed may be contemplated but is speculative at this time. If and when UCSD proposes additional expansion, which requires discretionary action, it will be subject to additional CEQA review to be completed at that time. Evaluating the cumulative impact of future UCSD expansion would be purely speculative at this time.
I-11	Similar to the response to comment I-10, which refers to additional growth for the UCSD Campus, this comment refers to a parcel, which does not have a development proposal; nor are there any discretionary actions or applications on file with the City. Therefore, it is not considered a cumulative project. Evaluating a cumulative impact would be purely speculative at this time.
I-12	Comment noted. The project would implement the referenced project objective through implementation of the TDM strategies detailed in Section 3.3.5 of the SEIR. As discussed in response to comment E-16, instead of a shuttle, the project is proposing to provide employee access to a rideshare service such as Uber or Lyft at no cost to the employee when accessed and utilized within a 2-mile radius of the Campus Point Master Plan project. This type of service will provide demand-responsive and scalable service convenient to employees within the Campus Point Master Plan area. This service would also provide wheelchair-accessible vehicles. The SEIR recognizes the condition of the existing bicycle network in Section 2.3.2 and Section 4.2.

<ul> <li>I-13 Comment noted. The SEIR recognizes that a CPA is proposed to amend the applicable language in the CPA to require the applicant to mitigate its peak-hour trip generation rate to a level equal to or less than that, which would be generated by a project of 20,000 square feet per acre. However, as detailed in Section 4.2.8 of the SEIR, the project would result in fewer direct and cumulative impacts compared to those discussed in the 1993 FEIR. Additionally, the 1993 Final EIR adopted findings of overriding considerations regarding the project's transportation impacts. Thus, although the current project analysis concludes that achieving the peak-hour trip generated by a project of</li> </ul>	
increased severity of impacts. In any event, the project would comply with the community plan as amended.	

The 1993 EIR was approved by the City Council with the inclusion of the "Eli Lilly/IVAC Campus Point Transportation Demand Management Plan" (Document No. RR-281674) in order to comply with the Community Plan. The Project proposes to not comply with the community plan. It proposes instead to change the requirement and amend the Community Plan to state: "Alexandria shall be required to mitigate its peak-hour trip generation rate to a level equal to or less than that which would be generated by a project of 20,000 sf/ac." Moreover, it provides no guarantee that the Project site will even meet the proposed 20,000 sf/ac. The proposed project should therefore comply with the community plan either by: - designing a TDM program that reduces the trips to comply with the Community Plan and is permanent adopting the Reduced Project Alternative **D.** Transportation 1. TDM Program The Draft SEIR states: "This TDM is an update to the TDM submitted with the previously certified 1993 EIR and will supersede the 1993 TDM." (Appendix C, p. 16-1). Unfortunately, the proposed TDM program is far weaker than the 1993 one. The proposed TDM should be revised to make it far stronger. The1993 TDM program approved by the City Council as a requirement of the 1993 EIR approval was designed to comply with the Community Plan, was mandatory, included monitoring (unannounced peak hour traffic counts), included enforcement and penalties for failing to meet the goals, and was permanent. By contrast, the TDM program proposed to replace it in the Draft SEIR: a. Does not meet the requirement in the Community Plan to mitigate their peak hour trip generation rate to a level equal to or less than that generated by a project of 18,000 SF/AC. b. provides no guarantees it will meet even the proposed Community Plan Amendment to change the requirement to mitigating to a peak hour trip generation rate for a project of 20,000 SF/AC. c. Defines peak hour as only 7-8 am and 5-6 pm (rather than the standard 2 hour peak definition) The definition of peak hour should be the standard 2 hour peak both am and pm I-15 d. does not include independent monitoring e. contains no enforcement provisions f. ends after 5 years g. major portions of it are not implemented for an undetermined length of time if at all

(project is at 75% occupancy)
 h. fails to provide assurances that the TDM program will achieve specific goals

The SEIR divides the TDM program into "Basic measures" (App. A, p. 16-2), which are minimal, and "Advanced TDM measures to be applied if target isn't reached" (p. 16-3).

I-17 The SEIR should provide a revised TDM program that:

I-14

I-15

I-16

- The TDM is not used as CEQA mitigation; rather, it would be attached as conditions of the permit. Since project impacts are analyzed and mitigated to the greatest extent feasible under CEQA without considering the effects of the TDM; and the TDM is not used to mitigate for traffic-related impacts within the purview of CEQA, this comment is not relevant to the adequacy or accuracy of the SEIR. However, in a good faith effort to address this comment, the TDM plan has been augmented with additional TDM options. The TDM plan currently includes independent monitoring by a licensed Traffic Engineer with review by the City as requested. The TDM plan also includes shuttle services for two hours during the AM and PM peak periods instead of the peak hour. An enhanced alternative to fixed-route shuttle service is now included which will utilize rideshare services such as Uber or Lyft to provide non-fixed route, demand responsive and scalable services for tenants of Campus Point. In addition, the alternative compliance option has been removed and the project occupancy threshold has been removed so that all TDM measures apply starting at certificate of occupancy. As requested, the TDM program is a permanent condition of approval. However, the monitoring period will last five years in order to ensure program effectiveness and fine-tune TDM measures to achieve the targets in the plan. In any event, this minor revision does not affect any conclusion of the EIR regarding any impacts to transportation.
- I-15 See response to comment I-14.
- I-16 See response to comment I-14.
- I-17 See response to comment I-14.

3

I-14

I-18	<ul> <li>a. includes independent monitoring, reporting and enforcement</li> <li>b. achieves higher reduction of single occupant vehicle trips during the <u>two hour</u> am and two hour pm peak hour times</li> <li>c. implements the "Advanced TDM measures" starting at certificate of occupancy for CP3, with the TDM program applying to the entire campus (i.e. all tenants in all buildings)</li> <li>d. is permanent (no matter who the property owners or tenants are)</li> </ul> 2. Bikeability The Project location does not have good or safe bicycle access. Thus the TDM measures that	I-18	As discussed in the EIR Appendix C, Page 13-1, bicycle access to the project site is provided on Campus Point Drive between Genesee Avenue and Campus Point Court via Class III bike lanes. The project seeks to enhance bike ability through the provision of a bikeshare program, bike repair stations, showers, and bike lockers. These measures will be supplemented when Campus Point Drive is restriped to four lanes. Per the City of San Diego Street Design Manual, Class II bike lanes are shown in the cross section of a 4- lane collector. It is anticipated that some parking on Campus Point Drive will be removed enhancing bicycle safety and eliminating
	promote commuting by bike (3 of the 8 "Basic TDM Measures – App. A, p. 16-2) are highly unlikely to have much impact (bike lockers, showers, bike repair stations). Campus Point Drive currently has Class III bike lanes with sharrows. The SEIR needs to acknowledge and address this problem and propose immediate improvements to bikeability on Campus Point, including Class II bike lanes. One of the future (2035) traffic mitigation measures is to remove parking on Campus Point, making it 4 lane collector with LOS E, capacity 30,000 ADT consistent with the Community Plan. Even this future measure makes no mention of adding even Class II bike lanes.		conflicts and visibility issues caused by parked cars and doors opening into a travel lane. When design of the restriping of Campus Point Drive is completed, an option to add Class II bike lanes to the extent feasible will be explored subject to approval of the City Engineer. Although the applicant is only obligated to provide a 19.41 fair-share payment for the removal of parking on
I-19	<ul> <li>3. Parking</li> <li>The Draft SEIR states that the parking ratio will be 2.74 stalls per 1,000 SF for scientific research. This exceeds the minimum requirements per the municipal code of 2.5 spaces per 1,000 SF of SR (Draft SEIR, p. 12-1 – Appendix I).</li> <li>By exceeding the minimum parking requirement, the Project undercuts one of its major goals: "Use the site in a way that would contribute to regional goals to reduce vehicle use and promote alternative transportation use by providing a facility within a convenient distance of present and future alternative transportation facilities." (3-2)</li> <li>The SEIR should be revised to lower the ratio of parking to 2.5 spaces per 1,000 for the entire campus.</li> </ul>		the east side of Campus Point Drive and restriping to add an additional northbound lane, that applicant has agreed to fully fund these improvements. It should be noted that no bicycle facilities on Campus Point Drive are called for in the University City Community Plan (Figure 23). The City of San Diego Bicycle Master Plan calls for Class II or III bike lanes on Campus Point Drive as
I-20	<b>E. Biology</b> As stated in the SEIR, "a majority of the site is directly adjacent, or in close proximity, to the MHPA (Biology, p. 18). The wildlife corridors are not adequately identified and the impacts to them are not adequately evaluated. This promontory of mesa and slopes is a crucial intersection of linkages to Los Peñasquitos Canyon, Los Peñasquitos lagoon, Carroll Canyon, Lopez Canyon, Rose Canyon, MCAS Miramar, and to the south via UCSD ecological preserve. This site has been identified by the San Diego Management and Monitoring Program as a regionally important corridor that needs to be protected and improved. ( <u>https://portal.sdmmp.com/</u> )	I-19	planned and discussed in the MND. This does not affect any conclusion of the SEIR regarding any impacts to transportation or bicycle usage or access. Parking. As discussed in the MND Appendix A, Page 12-1, the
I-21	The function of the project site itself as a wildlife corridor and the anticipated impacts are undervalued in the EIR: The change from parking lot to tall buildings is not inconsequential for birds, flying insects, and even some mammals. In addition, believe that there will be significant impacts to open space habitat and species through direct and indirect and cumulative effects to the west as well as to the north and east. Impacts will result from traffic, noise, light, movement, and tall structures, which limit and affect animal movement and behavior.		minimum parking requirement per the City of San Diego Municipal Code is 2.5 spaces per 1,000 square feet. The project would provide a parking ratio of 2.74 spaces per 1,000 square feet, which slightly exceeds the minimum. The City of San Diego Municipal Code allows a maximum parking ratio for scientific research and
I-22	These impacts should be mitigated in the same canyon system and wildlife corridor. We are particularly concerned about the biological impacts from this project, given that the city has 4		development uses of 4 spaces per 1,000 square feet (Table 142- 05G). Therefore, the proposed parking falls within the required range and is close to the minimum parking ratio allowed by Code.

I-19 (con	t.)
	This slight increase above the minimum is consistent with the major goals of the project as well as applicable policies and standards.
	As detailed in Section 4.3.1.5, the project site is not in proximity to a significant wildlife corridor. The site is on the edge of an un-named urban canyon system, which is immediately restricted by Interstate 5 to the north and west and residential and commercial development to the south. The canyon continues to the east, where it ultimately connects with Soledad Canyon. Additionally, the original 1993 FEIR concluded impacts related to biological resources were less than significant and the proposed project footprint would occur within the disturbed/developed portion of the site farthest away from the MHPA, with the except of the small area of improvements along Campus Point Drive.
	See response to comment I-20. Biological impacts related to wildlife corridors are fully analyzed in Section 4.3 of the SEIR. Further, the SEIR addressed as redesigned project, which locates the proposed buildings as far from the MHPA and other biological resources as possible.
	Please refer to response to comment I-11, this comment refers to a parcel, which does not have an application on file with the City and there are no discretionary actions associated with this parcel. Therefore, it is not considered a cumulative project. Evaluating a cumulative impact would be purely speculative at this time. Further, the parcel is not owned or controlled by the applicant and has no nexus to the project. Lastly, this comment does not raise any substantive issues relating to the adequacy or accuracy of the SEIR. No further response is required.

#### I-23

proposed to sell for further development the undeveloped 42 acres at the north end of Campus Point Drive. Please note that the UCPG has voted twice in favor of permanent protection of these city-owned parcels, that are in the MHPA but not fully conserved as habitat preserve. In 2012 the UCPG voted 12-3 in favor of dedication of these parcels as open space; on March 8, 2016, the UCPG voted (12-0-3) to recommend that the city remove from consideration for sale the 3 parcels at the north terminus of CPD and reiterated their support for preserving these as permanent open space for habitat.)

#### |-23 F. Public Safety - Overflights from MCAS Miramar

The project site is within the MCAS Miramar flight corridor overlay. The consistency determination from the ALUC in 2013 made no mention of a restaurant. Restaurants in this area are of concern to Miramar. In the ALUC determination, it is stated that if there are any changes, re-submission is required. If a new restaurant is proposed in conjunction with the brewery, a new consistency determination is required.

With regard to the height of the building, an official air space determination from the FAA that the proposed height poses no hazard to air navigation is required, regardless of height proposed.

#### G. Other issues not addressed in the SEIR

#### I-24 1. Green Building

The project fails to offer a high level of green building design. The Draft SEIR states the buildings have been designed to achieve LEED Silver certification (p. ES-2). Yet Alexandria retrofitted the existing on-site CP1 building (the IVAC building) to LEED Platinum. The SEIR should describe what would be required for the new buildings and facilities to achieve LEED Platinum certification and either revise the project to do so or explain why ARE is proposing only LEED Silver.

#### I-25 2. Fire and Earthquake hazards

The issues of emergency egress and access in the event of wildfire and earthquake were not adequately analyzed.

Installing a brewery is not a good idea; encouraging people to drink alcohol before their drive home is not responsible.

Thank you for the opportunity to review this document.

Janay Kruger Chair, University Community Planning Group

cc: UCPG Planning Group Members

ALUC staff has determined that re-submission of the project for a subsequent consistency determination is not warranted or required because the project is consistent with the MCAS Miramar ALUCP and the City of San Diego's ALUCP implementing regulations contained in Municipal Code Section 132.1501 et seq. The scope of the ALUC's review is limited to the CPA, and the revised project is consistent with the ALUC's 2015 consistency determination and does not change the conclusions and determination made by the ALUC in Resolution No. 2015-0005 ALUC.

The project has received an FAA letter "Determination of No Hazard to Air Navigation" dated February 17, 2017 which is provided in Appendix B. The FAA letter states that the proposed structure does not exceed obstruction standards and would not be a hazard to air navigation.

I-24 This comment does not raise any substantive issues related to the adequacy or accuracy or the SEIR. The project applicant has agreed to achieve a minimum LEED Gold certification for the proposed CP3 building and even the lowest certification level (LEED Silver) requires a great deal of sensitivity to environmental issues, in particular to issues relating to energy use and climate change, that more than satisfies the requirements of CEQA. No additional response is required.

I-25 Emergency access in the event of wildfire and earthquake or other type of emergency is provided via Campus Point Drive as discussed on page 12-1 of the traffic study. There are two access points on Campus Point Drive at the end of the existing cul-de-sac, which provide multiple options for ingress and egress sufficient in the event of an emergency. Therefore, multiple access points to the public road system are provided consistent with City requirements. This access plan has been reviewed by fire and has been found to be adequate for the needs of the proposed development. Additional non-vehicular access is also provided as discussed in Section 12.0 of the traffic study.

5

I-25 (cont.) Relative to the comment regarding the brewery, this is not an issue
that applies to CEQA. However, this comment is included within the final SEIR for consideration by the decision makers.

RESPONSE

J-1 Letter | Friends of Rose Canvon PO Box 221051, San Diego, CA 92192-1051 858-597-0220 \* rosecanyon@san.rr.com Martha Blake Development Services Department City of San Diego February 10, 2017 **Re: Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Report** Campus Point Master Plan, Project No. 336364 Submitted via email: DSDEAS@sandiego.gov Dear Ms. Blake: Friends of Rose Canyon submits the following comments. J-1 1. The traffic study was done at 8/1000 sq' ADT, which in the City's 2003 Trip J-2 Generation Manual is for S/R. Yet Alexandria has stated that the proposed new building (CP3) will likely be for office use. Thus the traffic study should assume 10/1000 sq' ADT. At 8/1000 sq' ADT, the Draft SEIR significantly understates the project traffic the Project would generate. 2. The Project is proposing to exceed the minimum parking requirements per the 1-2 municipal code of 2.5 spaces per 1,000 SF of scientific research. (Traffic Study p. 12-1). As stated, it will have 2.5 parking spaces per 1,000 SF for the existing CP1 building (the city's stated S/R ratio). However, the Project proposes 2.9 parking spaces per 1,000 SF for 10290 Campus Pointe (the new building). This is substantially above the minimum parking for S/R. This raises two issues: a. is this increased parking being proposed because the new building (CP3) will have office use and thus require more parking? In that case, the traffic study should be redone to use a higher trip generation rate. b. the TDM program claims it will substantially reduce ADT. If the TDM program will in fact do that, the parking ratio should be the minimum for S/R (2/5 per 1,000 sq. ft.). The parking numbers undercut both the traffic study's use of 8/1000 sq' used in the traffic study and the claimed effectiveness of the proposed TDM measures. J-3 3. CP2 (the old Qualcomm building) is listed in the Draft SEIR as 267,934 GSF. However, the San Diego Business Journal stated in its June 9, 2016 article on the purchase that the building was 304,326-square-feet. And the SDUT stated in its article

As discussed in the project description, the proposed project is an expansion of an existing 731,725-square-foot scientific research campus. The facility is called the Alexandria Center for Life Science at Campus Point and includes existing tenants such as Celgene and Eli Lilly which are companies devoted to developing new products in the pharmaceutical industry. These uses will continue and be expanded as discussed in the EIR and traffic study. The use of a Scientific Research and Development trip generation rate is consistent with definitions in the City of San Diego, Trip Generation Manual. Specifically, the Trip Generation Manual defines "A scientific research and development facility is a single-tenant facility devoted to the discovery and development of new products (or the improvement of an existing product)." The Campus Point Master Plan is designed as a "business park campus" with amenities supporting multiple single tenants as described above.

The proposed parking ratio of 2.74 spaces per 1,000 square feet for the overall Campus Point Master Plan is well within the allowable range specified by the City of San Diego Municipal Code. The Municipal Code (Table 142-05G) specifies a minimum parking ratio of 2.5 spaces per 1,000 square feet and maximum parking ratio of 4.0 per 1,000 square feet for Scientific Research and Development uses. The proposed parking ratio of 2.74 per 1,000 square feet is substantially closer to the lower end of this range. The City of San Diego Municipal Code regulates parking separately from trip generation, which is based on the City of San Diego, Trip Generation Manual. The availability of surplus parking not exceeding the maximum parking ratio specified by Code does not impact the trip generation rate used for the study. In addition, the trip generation rate utilized in the EIR traffic study does not account for reductions in trips caused by the establishment of a TDM program. The TDM program is an additional benefit, which is expected to further reduce the number of trips during peak times below what is indicated in the EIR traffic study using standard trip generation rates. This TDM program is independent of parking except for parking cash-out incentives, which have been established.

"Eli Lilly doubling size of San Diego biotech center" (July 23, 2015) that its new research space at the Qualcomm building will be 300,000 sq. ft. Thus the Draft SEIR appears to greatly understate the size of the CP 2.

J-4 4. The Draft SEIR states in some places that the proposed project (building CP3) would be 10 stories and in some places 12 stories. (Traffic Study, ES, 1-1: "the proposed project would add a third 10 level building totaling approximately 318,383 SF of scientific research ("CP3"). "

When the UCPG Subcommittee met with Alexandria on 5/26/16, members were told CP3 would be a 10-story building and given a Proposed Masterplan specifically listing CP3 as 10 stories. I and other members of the Subcommittee were concerned with the visual impact of the height of the building. Yet now the height has morphed into 12 stories in some parts of the Draft SEIR. The SEIR needs to be consistent in the way it describes the Project.

- J-5 5. Worse yet, the Draft SEIR contains no visualizations of the building from I-5 or views from the north and west. Because the building is on a mesa top, its visibility from a distance and the impact of its height is much greater than the buildings to which its height is compared in the Draft SEIR and, the Project is in fact significantly higher than the buildings to which it is compared. The SEIR needs to clarify whether this is a 10 story or 12-story building, and accurately show the visual impact of the building.
- J-6 6 The Draft SEIR states that CP4 will house "a kitchen and dining area". It goes on to state that according to city regulations, accessory uses, which include a restaurant/deli, should be permitted to ten percent of the gross floor area with various conditions, including that they are located within the principal building of the project, which this kitchen and dining area are not.

Sincerely,

Deborah Knight Executive Director J-3 The existing CP2 building is consistently called out in the SEIR as being 267,934 square feet. The square footage figures used in the referenced press reports are not based upon the rules of calculation and measurement utilized by the City of San Diego in calculating "gross floor area" and also included square footage of certain common areas on the campus that the tenant will have access to per the lease arrangement.

- J-4 The CP3 building is consistently called out as a split-level 6- and-12story building in the SEIR, including the certification page. Contrary to the commenter's assertion, the University Community Planning Group Subcommittee was shown renderings of the proposed splitlevel 6- and 12-story CP3 building at the referenced 5/26/16 meeting.
- J-5 Please refer to response to comment J-4. The change in height does not change the analysis for Issue 1 of visual quality (public views) because it does not affect a public view. As to Issue 2 (neighborhood character), the change in height is not significant given the architectural stylings, such building tiering and stepbacks. The change in height is not germane to Issue 3 (light and glare) because the building will still comply with reduction measures.
- J-6 The project complies with all of the limitations prescribed for accessory commercial uses in the University Community Plan, including limiting the maximum of such commercial accessory uses to 10 percent of total gross floor area and requiring that commercial facilities be orientated to the interior of the project. The Campus Point Master Plan includes four buildings and a parking structure and the proposed CP4 building is located near the center of the 58.19-acre project site and is surrounded by the three research and development buildings and parking structure. The CP4 building will include a microbrewery (which is a light industrial use) in addition to the kitchen and dining area and other amenities.
Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Report for the Campus Point Project San Diego, California Project No. 336364 SCH No. 2014091073

April 5, 2017

#### TABLE OF CONTENTS

List	of Abb	previated Termsv
Exec	utive	SummaryES-1
1.	Intr	oduction1-1
	1.1	SEIR Purpose and Intended Uses1-2
	1.2	SEIR Legal Authority1-2
	1.3	SEIR Scope and Content and Format1-3
	1.4	SEIR Process1-8
2.	Envi	ironmental Setting2-1
	2.1	Regional Setting
	2.2	Project Location
	2.3	Physical Environment
	2.4	Public Utilities and Services2-7
	2.5	Planning Context2-8
3.	Proj	ect Description3-1
	3.1	Project Background
	3.2	Project Objectives
	3.3	Project Components
	3.4	Discretionary Actions
	3.5	History of Project Changes
4.	Envi	ronmental Analysis4-1
	4.1	Land Use 4.1-1
	4.2	Transportation/Circulation 4.2-1
	4.3	Biological Resources 4.3-1
	4.4	Historical Resources 4.4-1
	4.5	Paleontological Resources 4.5-1
	4.6	Visual Quality/Neighborhood Character4.6-1
5.	Sign	ificant Unavoidable Environmental Effects/Irreversible Changes5-1
	5.1	Significant Environmental Effects Which Cannot Be Avoided
		if the Project Is Implemented5-1
	5.2	Irreversible Environmental Changes Which Would Result
		if the Project Is Implemented5-3
6.	Gro	wth Inducement6-1
	6.1	Population and Growth Projections6-2
	6.2	Public Infrastructure6-2
7.	Cum	nulative Impacts
	7.1	Land Use
	7.2	Transportation/Circulation7-5
	7.3	Biological Resources

	7.4	Historical Resources	7-6
	7.5	Paleontological Resources	7-6
	7.6	Visual Quality/Neighborhood Character	7-6
	7.7	Geologic Conditions	
	7.8	Health and Safety/Hazardous Materials	7-7
	7.9	Hydrology	7-7
	7.10	Water Quality	7-8
	7.11	Air Quality	7-8
	7.12	Noise	
	7.13	Public Services and Utilities	7-9
	7.14	Agricultural Resources	
	7.15	Mineral Resources	
	7.16	Energy Conservation	
	7.17	Population and Housing	7-11
8.	1993	FEIR Subject Areas Requiring No Change in Analysis	8-1
	8.1	Geologic Conditions	
	8.2	Health and Safety/Hazardous Materials	8-3
	8.3	Hydrology	8-4
	8.4	Water Quality	8-6
	8.5	Air Quality	8-8
	8.6	Noise	
	8.7	Public Services and Utilities	
	8.8	Agricultural Resources	8-20
	8.9	Mineral Resources	8-20
	8.10	Energy Conservation	
	8.11	Population and Housing	8-21
9.	Proje	ct Alternatives	9-1
	9.1	Alternatives Analyzed in 1993 FEIR	9-4
	9.2	No Project (No Development) Alternative	9-5
	9.3	Reduced Development Alternative	9-7
	9.4	Environmentally Superior Alternative	9-10
10.	Mitig	ation Monitoring and Reporting Program	10-1
11.	Refer	rences Cited	11-1
12.	Indiv	iduals and Agencies Consulted	12-1
13.	Certi	fication	13-1

#### FIGURES

2-1:	Regional Location	2-2
2-2:	Project Location on USGS Map	2-3
	Project Location on Aerial Photograph	
2-4:	Existing Land Use Designation	2-9
2-5:	UCP Land Use Intensity Subarea Map	2-10

#### FIGURES (cont.)

2-6:	University Community Plan Implementation Overlay Zone (CPIOZ)	
2-7:	Existing Zoning	
2-8:	Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA)	
2-9:	Safety Zones for MCAS Miramar	
3-1:	Site Plan for the 1993 PID & FEIR	3-3
3-2:	Illustrative Site Plan	3-4
3-3:	Site Plan	3-5
3-4a:	CP3 Elevations	3-7
3-4b:	CP3 Cross Sections	3-8
3-5a:	CP4 Elevations	3-9
3-5b:	CP4 Cross Sections	
3-6:	Parking Structure Elevations	
3-7:	Limits of Work and Brush Management Zones	
3-8:	Accessibility Plan	
3-9:	Representative Examples of Project Trees, Amenity Areas, and Hardscape	
3-10a:	Landscaping Plan, Western Portion of Project Site	
3-10b:	Landscaping Plan, Central Portion of Project Site	
3-10c:	Landscaping Plan, Eastern Portion of Project Site	
3-11:	Conceptual Grading Plan	
4.1-1:	General Plan Land Use and Street System Map	4.1-3
4.1-2:	MHPA Boundary Line Correction	
4.1-3:	Aircraft Noise Contours for MCAS Miramar	
4.2-1:	Traffic Study Area	4.2-3
4.2-2:	Existing Average Daily Traffic	4.2-5
4.2-3:	Project Only Average Daily Traffic	4.2-11
4.2-4:	Existing Plus Project Average Daily Traffic	
4.2-5:	Near-term Plus Project Average Daily Traffic	4.2-19
4.2-6:	Horizon Year Plus Project Average Daily Traffic	
4.3-1:	Existing Biological Resources	
4.3-2:	Project Impacts	
4.3-3:	Covenant of Easement	

#### TABLES

Summary of Significant Environmental Analysis Results: New or Substantially	
Increased Impacts	ES-3
Summary of Significant Environmental Impacts	ES-7
Impact Assessment Summary 1993 EIR	1-5
Project Development Summary	
Summary of Project Consistency with Applicable Land Use Plans Goals	
and Objectives	
Comparison of Existing and Corrected MHPA Boundary	
Existing Street Segment Levels of Service	4.2-4
Existing Intersection Levels of Service	4.2-6
Existing Freeway Segment Levels of Service	4.2-6
Significance Thresholds	4.2-8
	Increased Impacts Summary of Significant Environmental Impacts Impact Assessment Summary 1993 EIR Project Development Summary Summary of Project Consistency with Applicable Land Use Plans Goals and Objectives Comparison of Existing and Corrected MHPA Boundary Existing Street Segment Levels of Service Existing Intersection Levels of Service Existing Freeway Segment Levels of Service

#### TABLES (cont.)

4.2-5:	Project Trip Traffic
4.2-6:	Existing and Existing with Project Street Segment Comparison
4.2-7:	Existing and Existing with Project Intersection Summary
4.2-8:	Near-term and Near-term with Project Street Segment Comparison
4.2-9:	Near-term and Near-term with Project Intersection Summary
4.2-10:	Horizon Year 2035 and Horizon Year 2035 with Project Street Segment Comparison 4.2-21
4.2-11:	Horizon Year 2035 and Horizon Year 2035 with Project Intersection Comparison
4.2-12:	Near-term & Near-term with Project Ramp Meter Analysis Comparison
4.2-13:	Horizon Year 2035 & Horizon Year 2035 with Project Ramp Meter Analysis
4.2-14:	Impact Comparison Table
4.3-1:	Existing Vegetation Communities/Land Cover Types within the Project Area
4.3-2:	Impacts to Vegetation Communities/Land Cover Types within the Corrected MHPA 4.3-16
4.5-1:	Paleontological Grading Thresholds
7-1:	List of Projects in Vicinity Used to Evaluation Cumulative Effects7-2
8-1:	Proposed Project Runoff Rates8-5
8-2:	Traffic Noise Level Increases
8-3:	Exterior Noise Limits
8-4:	Total Waste Generated, Diverted, and Disposed by Phase
9-1:	Comparison of Project and Alternatives Impacts Summary9-3
10-1:	Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

#### APPENDICES

- A: Notice of Preparation and Comments
- B: ALUC/FAA determinations
- C: Traffic Impact Study
- D: Biological Resources Report
- E: Archaeological Resources Report
- F-1: Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation
- F-2: Addendum to Storm Water Management Recommendations
- G: Hydrology and Hydraulic Study
- H: Storm Water Quality Management Plan
- I: Air Quality Analysis
- J: Noise Analysis
- K: Waste Management Plan
- L: Sewer Study

# List of Abbreviated Terms

ADD	Assistant Deputy Director
ADRP	Archaeological Data Recovery Program
ADT	average daily trips
AIA	Airport Influence Area
ALUCOZ	Airport Land Use Compatibility Overlay Zone
ALUCP	Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan
AME	Archaeological Monitoring Exhibit
AMSL	above mean sea level
APE	area of potential effect
APN	Assessor's Parcel Number
APZ	Accident Potential Zone
BCME	Biological Construction Mitigation/Monitoring Exhibit
BI	building inspector
BLA	Boundary line adjustment
BLC	Boundary line correction
BMP	Best Management Practice
BMZ	Brush Management Zone
CAAQS	California Ambient Air Quality Standards
CalEEMod	California Emissions Estimator Model
CALGreen	California Green Building Standards Code
Caltrans	California Department of Transportation
CARB	California Air Resources Board
CDFW	California Department of Fish and Wildlife
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
Cfs	cubic feet per second
City	City of San Diego
CLUP	Compatibility Land Use Plan
СМ	construction manager
CNEL	Community Noise Equivalent Level
СО	carbon monoxide
CPA	Community Plan Amendment
CPIOZ	Community Plan Implementation Overlay Zone
CRHR	California Register of Historic Resources
CSVR	Consultant Site Visit Record
dB	decibel
dB(A)	A-weighted decibels
DPR	Department of Parks and Recreation
DSD	Development Services Department

EAC.	Environmental Analysis Costion
EAS	Environmental Analysis Section
EIR	Environmental Impact Report
SEIR	Supplemental Environmental Impact Report
EMS	Emergency Medical Services
EMT	Emergency Medical Technician
ESA	Endangered Species Act
ESL	Environmentally Sensitive Lands
FAA	Federal Aviation Administration
FAR	Floor Area Ratio
FESA	Federal Endangered Species Act
GC	grading contractor
GHG	greenhouse gas
HCP	habitat conservation plan
HRG	Historical Resources Guidelines
HVAC	heating, ventilation, and air conditioning
I-5	Interstate 5
I-805	Interstate 805
IP	Industrial Park
ITP	incidental take permit
ITS	Intelligent Transportation Systems
LDC	Land Development Code
LEED	Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design
LEED B+C	Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design Building Design + Construction
L <sub>eq</sub>	hourly equivalent sound level
LID	Low-Impact Development
LOS	level of service
L <sub>pw</sub>	Sound power level
MBTA	Migratory Bird Treaty Act
MCAS	Marine Corps Air Station
MHPA	Multi-Habitat Planning Area
MHPA-LUAG	Multi-Habitat Planning Area Land Use Adjacency Guidelines
MLD	Most Likely Descendent
MMC	Mitigation Monitoring Coordination
MMRP	Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
MWD	
	Metropolitan Water District miles per hour
mph	•
MSCP	Multiple Species Conservation Program
MTS	Metropolitan Transit System
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NAHC	Native American Heritage Commission
NB	northbound
NCCP	Natural Community Conservation Planning
NDP	Neighborhood Development Permit
NO <sub>2</sub>	nitrogen dioxide
NOP	Notice of Preparation
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System

# ES

# **Executive Summary**

# S.1 Project Synopsis

This summary provides a brief synopsis of: (1) the proposed Campus Point project (project), (2) the results of the environmental analysis contained within this Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (SEIR), (3) the alternatives to the project that were considered, and (4) the major areas of controversy and issues to be resolved by decision-makers. This summary does not contain the extensive background and analysis found in the document. Therefore, the reader should review the entire document to fully understand the project and its environmental consequences.

## S.1.1 Project Location and Setting

The project site is located within the City of San Diego, within San Diego County. The 58.19-acre project site is located within the University Community Plan (UCP) area in the northwestern portion of the City. The UCP area encompasses approximately 8,500 acres and is generally bounded by Los Peñasquitos Lagoon and Torrey Pines on the north, Interstate 805 (I-805) and Mira Mesa on the east, State Route 52 (SR-52) on the south, and La Jolla and the Pacific Ocean on the west.

The project site is situated between Interstate 5 (I-5) and I-805, approximately 0.5 mile south of where they converge (see Figure 2-1), on a private driveway at 10290 and 10300 Campus Point Drive (Assessor's Parcel Numbers 343-230-13 and 343-230-14). The project site is in the unsectioned Pueblo Lands of San Diego land grant of the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) 7.5-minute topographic map, Del Mar quadrangle. The project site is bound on the north by undeveloped land, on the west by a steep hillside adjacent to I-5, on the east by vacant land, and on the south by industrial development.

## S.1.2 Project Objectives

The following are the objectives for the project.

- Provide the region with additional job opportunities in the life science and biotech industries.
- Intensify existing industrial/research uses in a manner that provides a campus-like environment with comprehensive site design and substantial landscaping.
- Enhance the access, orientation, and walkability of the existing site.
- Provide an inviting, high-quality scientific research campus that incorporates sustainable design measures.
- Contribute to regional goals to reduce vehicle use and promote alternative transportation use by providing a facility within a convenient distance of present and future alternative transportation facilities.
- Create a coherent and cohesive building and site design that is compatible in scale and character and enhances the existing community character in the UCP.

## S.1.3 Project Description

The proposed project entails intensifying an existing 731,725-square-foot scientific research and development facility by 328,383 square feet; thereby creating a 1,060,108-square-foot science and business park, characterized by a campus-like environment with comprehensive site design and substantial landscaping. The project would add two new buildings and an associated parking structure within previously disturbed land that is currently occupied by surface parking. The project would entail the construction of a 12- and 6-story split-level multi-tenant building (CP3), a 2-story building housing a micro-brewery with accessory dining space and shared tenant amenity spaces (CP4), and a 9-level (including three subterranean levels) parking structure to accommodate 1,440 parking stalls within the 58.19-acre project site. As shown in Table ES-1, the total floor area of the site would not exceed 1,060,108 square feet (including the existing 731,725 square footage for buildings CP1 and CP2).

A majority of the proposed structures and improvements would be constructed in the southwest quadrant of the project site in the location of existing surface parking. The proposed CP3 research and development building would be located at the southwestern end of the property. The 2-story CP4 amenity structure would be located just east of the proposed building CP3 in the southwestern portion of the site. The parking garage would be located at the southern end of the project site, just south and east of proposed building CP4. A new loading dock/utility area and trash/recycle area would be located south of building CP3.Minor improvements to the trash enclosure area would also be completed in the northern portion of the site, north of the existing building CP1. The buildings have been designed to achieve Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Silver, which requires several energy- and insulation-efficiency measures to be included in the design of the structures.

Table ES-1 Project Development Summary		
Type Amount		
Buildings		
Existing Building CP1	463,791	
Existing Building CP2	267,934	
Existing Central Plant CP1-1	9,044 <sup>1</sup>	
Existing Central Plant CP2-1	7,310 <sup>1</sup>	
Proposed Building CP3	318,383 sf above-grade 44,000 sf below-grade <sup>1</sup>	
Proposed Building CP4	10,000 sf	
TOTAL PROPOSED SF <sup>2</sup>	<b>328,383</b> <sup>2</sup>	
TOTAL EXISTING + PROPOSED SF <sup>2</sup>	1,060,108 <sup>2</sup>	
Parking		
Existing Surface Stalls	2,574 stalls	
Evicting Surface Stalls to Demain	1,462 stalls	
Existing Surface Stalls to Remain	(1,126 surface stalls to be eliminated)	
Proposed Surface Stalls	7 stalls	
Proposed Six-Story Parking Structure	1,440 stalls	
with two subterranean levels	(471 subterranean, 969 above grade)	
TOTAL PROPOSED	1,447	
TOTAL EXISTING + PROPOSED	2,909 stalls	
Landscaping		
10290 Campus Point Drive	275,079 sf	
10300 Campus Point Drive	902,930 sf	
TOTAL EXISTING + PROPOSED	1,178,009 sf (46% of gross)	
<sup>1</sup> Not counted toward development intensity cal- <sup>2</sup> Total includes square footage considered in de unoccupied utility/central plant structures and t included with building CP3.	velopment intensity calculation. Excludes the	

sf = square feet

# S.2 Summary of Significant Effects and Mitigation Measures that Reduce or Avoid the Significant Effects

Table ES-2, located at the end of this section, summarizes the significant effects identified during the environmental analysis completed for the project. Table ES-2 also includes mitigation measures to reduce or avoid the environmental effects, with a conclusion as to whether the impact has been mitigated to below a level of significance. The mitigation measures listed in Table ES-2 are also discussed within each relevant topical area.

Standard environmental mitigation measures are proposed during the grading and construction phase to reduce adverse environmental effects related to those activities. Additional measures are

proposed from a project design standpoint to reduce long-term adverse impacts for the issues of land use, traffic circulation, biological resources, historical resources, and paleontological resources. These environmental measures, in addition to further discussion of potential and anticipated environmental impacts, are detailed in Chapter 4, and further discussed in Chapters 5, 7, 8, and 9.

## S.3 Areas of Controversy

The Notice of Preparation (NOP) was distributed on September 26, 2014, for a 30-day public review and comment period. Public comments received on the NOP reflect controversy related to several environmental issues. The NOP and comment letters are included in this EIR as Appendix A. Controversy associated with the project primarily concerns the issues of land use, traffic circulation, and biological resources. All of these issues are analyzed in the EIR.

# S.4 Issues to be Resolved by the Decision-Making Body

The City of San Diego (City) will need to decide in a public hearing if there are overriding considerations that would offset the significant and in the short-term unmitigated traffic impacts and associated community plan inconsistency. In addition, the City shall determine if the significant impacts associated with the environmental issues of land use, transportation/circulation, biological resources, historical resources, and paleontological resources would be fully mitigated to below a level of significance. The City will also decide if the project conforms to regulations and policies, such as those in the General Plan and the UCP. Lastly, the City will determine whether any alternative might meet the key objectives of the project while reducing its environmental impact.

# S.5 **Project Alternatives**

To fully evaluate the environmental effects of projects, the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) mandates that alternatives to the project be analyzed. Section 15126.6 of the CEQA Guidelines requires the discussion of "a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project" and the evaluation of the comparative merits of the alternatives. The alternatives discussion is intended to "focus on alternatives to the project or its location which are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant effects of the project," even if these alternatives would impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives.

The alternatives identified below are intended to reduce or avoid significant environmental effects of the project. The EIR addresses a No Project (No Development) Alternative and a Reduced Development Alternative. Each major issue area included in the impact analysis of this EIR has been given consideration in the alternatives analysis. Alternatives to the project are evaluated in full in Chapter 9 of this EIR.

### S.5.1 No Project (No Development) Alternative

The No Project (No Development) Alternative for the project would be maintaining the site in its current condition and would be equivalent to the existing environmental setting. The site presently contains an existing 2-story, 463,791-square-foot, multi-tenant building ("CP1") used for scientific research and development on Parcel 1, and a second 267,934-square-foot building ("CP2") on Parcel 2, along with parking and accessory structures.

Should the No Project (No Development) Alternative be implemented, all the project's significant impacts would be avoided. More specifically, this alternative would avoid the project's significant mitigated transportation/circulation, biological resource, historical resource, and paleontological resource impacts. Importantly, the significant unmitigated traffic impacts would also be avoided by the No Project (No Development) Alternative. While adoption of the No Project (No Development) Alternative would maintain the existing underdeveloped condition of the site and avoid impacts associated with the project, none of the project objectives would be attained.

### S.5.2 Reduced Development Alternative

The Reduced Development Alternative was designed to reduce the traffic trips generated in order to avoid significant and unmitigated traffic generation/UCP conformance impacts. The Reduced Development Alternative would involve construction of up to an additional 140,000 square feet plus an associated parking structure. The 140,000-square-foot building would be constructed at the location of CP3 and would be a 5-story building with 28,000 square feet per floor. The parking structure would be within the same footprint as the proposed project's parking structure, but would be approximately one-third the size. Thus, the primary difference between this alternative and the project would be that this alternative would not develop CP4, and both CP3 and the parking structure would be constructed to approximately one-third the size of what is proposed.

The parking structure would be of a size necessary to maintain a parking ratio of 2.5 spaces per 1,000 square feet, or approximately 350 spaces ([140,000 square feet ÷ 1,000 square feet] x 2.5). As with the proposed project, the Reduced Development Alternative would stay within the existing disturbed portion of the project site.

The Reduced Development Alternative would avoid the two significant and unmitigated traffic impacts and one of the significant but mitigated traffic impacts of the project. This alternative would also avoid the project's significant impacts related to traffic generation in excess of the UCP and would not require a Community Plan Amendment. All other impacts under the Reduced Development Alternative would be similar to the project although incrementally reduced, as the total square footage of proposed buildings would be smaller. Thus, this alternative would have significant but mitigated impacts related to land use, biological resources, historical resources, and paleontological resources, similar to the project. This alternative would meet the basic project objectives, although to a lesser degree than the project since it would provide less infill development.

### S.5.3 Environmentally Superior Alternative

CEQA Guidelines (Section 15126.6(e)(2)) require that an environmentally superior alternative be identified among the alternatives considered. The environmentally superior alternative is generally defined as the alternative which would result in the least adverse environmental impacts to the project site and surrounding area. If the No Project Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative, then the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative from the other alternatives.

The Reduced Development Alternative, as discussed in Section 9.3, would be considered the environmentally superior alternative since it would avoid several project impacts associated with traffic, including significant, temporarily unmitigated direct capacity impacts. Other impacts would be incrementally reduced or the same as the project. The Reduced Development Alternative would meet all of the project's objectives, though to a lesser degree than the project.

Table ES-2 Summary of Significant Environmental Impacts			
Environmental Issue	Results of Impact Analysis	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
Would the project conflict with the provisions of the City's Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) Subarea Plan and the Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA) or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	A total of 10.08 acres of MHPA occurs within the project site. The project would include a boundary line correction (BLC) to remove the previously developed portions of the project area site that were mapped as part of the MHPA at the regional scale. No MHPA occurs within the impact area where the BLC is applied. The project would be conditioned to show compliance with the MHCP Land Use Adjacency Guidelines.	<b>LU-1:</b> The project shall comply with the Land Use Adjacency Guidelines.	Less than Significant
Traffic Circulation Would the project result in an increase in projected traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system? Would the project result in a substantial impact upon existing or planned transportation systems?	A significant direct project impact, TR-1, would occur at project buildout on Genesee Avenue between the I-5 SB ramps and I-5 NB ramps. The bridge segment currently operates as a four-lane Major and is operating at unacceptable LOS E today. The project would result in the segment operating at LOS F.	<b>TR-1:</b> The City and Caltrans are currently widening the bridge segment to six lanes which would have a LOS E capacity of 60,000 ADT. The Genesee Avenue bridge widening project is fully funded and construction is anticipated to be complete by fall of 2017. However, project impact TR-1 would remain temporarily significant and unmitigated until the Caltrans improvements are completed.	Temporarily significant and unmitigated
	A significant cumulative impact, TR-2, would occur on Campus Point Drive between Genesee Avenue and Campus Point Court. This three-lane segment with two- way left-turn lane would operate at an unacceptable level of service (LOS) F with the proposed project in the Horizon Year.	<b>TR-2</b> : The applicant shall provide a 19.41 percent fair-share towards the removal of parking on the east side of Campus Point Drive and restriping to include an additional northbound lane.	Less than Significant

Table ES-2 Summary of Significant Environmental Impacts			
Environmental Issue	Results of Impact Analysis	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
	A significant direct project impact, TR-3, would occur at project buildout at the intersection of Genesee Avenue/Interstate 5 (I-5) SB ramp. The City and Caltrans are currently widening the bridge to six lanes which would have a LOS E capacity of 60,000 ADT.	<b>TR-3:</b> The improvements currently being constructed at the I-5/Genesee Avenue interchange would fully mitigate the direct project impacts. The interchange improvements are fully funded and construction is anticipated to be completed in fall 2017. Thus, the project's Genesee Avenue/I-5 ramp impact would remain temporarily significant and unmitigated until the Caltrans improvements are completed.	Temporarily significant and unmitigated
	A direct and cumulative impact, TR-4, would occur at the Genesee Avenue/La Jolla Village Drive intersection.	<b>TR-4:</b> The University Towne Center Revitalization Project will widen the northbound approach to the Genesee Avenue/La Jolla Village Drive intersection and provide a dedicated right-turn lane. These improvements are fully funded and construction is expected to begin in February 2017. These improvements will fully mitigate the project's direct and cumulative impacts. The impacts will remain significant and unmitigated until construction of the improvements are completed.	Temporarily significant and unmitigated
	A direct and cumulative impact, TR-5, would occur at the intersection of Campus Point Drive and Campus Point Court.	<b>TR-5:</b> Prior to the issuance of the first building permit the applicant shall assure by permit and bond the signalization of the Campus Point Drive/Campus Point Court intersection, to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.	Less than Significant

Table ES-2 Summary of Significant Environmental Impacts				
Environmental Issue	Results of Impact Analysis	Mitigation Installation of the signal and associated improvements shall be completed and accepted by the City Engineer prior to issuance of the first occupancy permit.	Impact Level After Mitigation	
BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES				
Would the project result in a substantial adverse impact, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in the MSCP or other local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)?	There is potential for nesting coastal California gnatcatcher, raptors, and other nesting birds within the project area. Direct impacts to coastal California gnatcatcher, raptors and other nesting birds could result from the removal of Diegan coastal sage scrub, non-native grassland, and eucalyptus woodland on-site. Direct impacts to the MSCP- covered coastal California gnatcatcher and Cooper's hawk through the removal of habitat outside of the MHPA are permitted through the MSCP and would not be considered significant. However, direct impacts to migratory or nesting birds would be considered significant. Additionally, project grading and construction has potential for indirect impacts to raptors, and other migratory or nesting birds from construction noise, intrusion, water quality, and lighting. Indirect impacts to migratory or nesting birds, including raptors would be significant.	<ul> <li>BIO-1: Due to the moderate to high potential of Cooper's hawk occurrences, in the event construction occurs in or near the MHPA within the breeding season (February 1 to September 15), an avoidance area of 300 feet from any Cooper's hawk nest that occurs within the MHPA shall be required. Additionally, BIO-2 shall be implemented.</li> <li>Biological Resource Protection During Construction</li> <li>BIO-2:</li> <li>I. Prior to Construction <ul> <li>A. Biologist Verification -The owner/permittee shall provide a letter to the City's Mitigation Monitoring Coordination (MMC) section stating that a Project Biologist (Qualified Biologist) as defined in the City of San Diego's Biological Guidelines (2012), has been retained to implement the project's biological monitoring program. The letter shall</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Less than Significant	

Table ES-2 Summary of Significant Environmental Impacts					
Environmental Issue	Results of Impact Analysis		Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation	
		В.	include the names and contact information of all persons involved in the biological monitoring of the project. Preconstruction Meeting - The		
			Qualified Biologist shall attend the preconstruction meeting, discuss the project's biological monitoring program, and arrange to perform any follow up mitigation measures and reporting including site-specific monitoring, restoration or revegetation, and additional fauna/flora surveys/salvage.		
		C.	<ul> <li>Biological Documents - The</li> <li>Qualified Biologist shall submit</li> <li>all required documentation to</li> <li>MMC verifying that any special</li> <li>mitigation reports including but</li> <li>not limited to, maps, plans,</li> <li>surveys, survey timelines, or</li> <li>buffers are completed or</li> <li>scheduled per City Biology</li> <li>Guidelines, Multiple Species</li> <li>Conservation Program (MSCP),</li> <li>Environmentally Sensitive</li> <li>Lands Ordinance (ESL), project</li> <li>permit conditions; California</li> <li>Environmental Quality Act</li> <li>(CEQA); endangered species</li> </ul>		

Table ES-2 Summary of Significant Environmental Impacts					
Environmental Issue	Results of Impact Analysis		Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation	
		D.	acts (ESAs); and/or other local, state or federal requirements. BCME - The Qualified Biologist shall present a Biological Construction		
			Mitigation/Monitoring Exhibit (BCME) which includes the biological documents in C above. In addition, include: restoration/revegetation plans, plant salvage/relocation requirements (e.g., coastal cactus wren plant salvage,		
			burrowing owl exclusions, etc.), avian or other wildlife surveys/survey schedules (including general avian nesting and USFWS protocol), timing of surveys, wetland buffers, avian		
			construction avoidance areas/noise buffers/ barriers, other impact avoidance areas, and any subsequent requirements determined by the Qualified Biologist and the City ADD/MMC. The BCME		
			shall include a site plan, written and graphic depiction of the project's biological mitigation/monitoring program, and a schedule. The		

Environmental Issue         Results of Impact Analysis         Mitigation         After Mitig           BCME shall be approved by MMC and referenced in the construction documents.         BCME shall be approved by MMC and referenced in the construction documents.         E.         Avian Protection Requirements - To avoid any direct impacts to raptors and/or candidate, sensitive, or special status species in the MSCP, removal of habitat that supports active nests in the proposed area of disturbance should occur outside of the breeding season for these species (February 1 to September 15). If removal of habitat in the proposed area of disturbance must occur during the breeding season, the Qualified Biologist shall conduct a pre-construction survey to determine the presence or absence of nesting birds on the proposed area of disturbance. The pre- construction survey shall be conducted within 10 calendar	Table ES-2 Summary of Significant Environmental Impacts					
MMC and referenced in the construction documents. E. Avian Protection Requirements - To avoid any direct impacts to raptors and/or candidate, sensitive, or special status species in the MSCP, removal of habitat that supports active nests in the proposed area of disturbance should occur outside of the breeding season for these species (February 1 to September 15). If removal of habitat in the proposed area of disturbance must occur during the breeding season, the Qualified Biologist shall conduct a pre-construction survey to determine the presence or absence of nesting birds on the proposed area of disturbance. The pre- construction survey shall be conducted within 10 calendar	Environmental Issue	Results of Impact Analysis	Impact LevelMitigationAfter Mitigation			
- To avoid any direct impacts to raptors and/or candidate, sensitive, or special status species in the MSCP, removal of habitat that supports active nests in the proposed area of disturbance should occur outside of the breeding season for these species (February 1 to September 15). If removal of habitat in the proposed area of disturbance must occur during the breeding season, the Qualified Biologist shall conduct a pre-construction survey to determine the presence or absence of nesting birds on the proposed area of disturbance. The pre- construction survey shall be conducted within 10 calendar			MMC and referenced in the construction documents.			
days prior to the start of         construction activities         (including removal of         vegetation). The applicant shall         submit the results of the pre-			E. Avian Protection Requirements - To avoid any direct impacts to raptors and/or candidate, sensitive, or special status species in the MSCP, removal of habitat that supports active nests in the proposed area of disturbance should occur outside of the breeding season for these species (February 1 to September 15). If removal of habitat in the proposed area of disturbance must occur during the breeding season, the Qualified Biologist shall conduct a pre-construction survey to determine the presence or absence of nesting birds on the proposed area of disturbance. The pre- construction survey shall be conducted within 10 calendar days prior to the start of construction activities (including removal of vegetation). The applicant shall			

Table ES-2 Summary of Significant Environmental Impacts				
				Impact Level
Environmental Issue	Results of Impact Analysis		Mitigation	After Mitigation
Environmental Issue	Results of Impact Analysis		Mitigation for review and approval prior to initiating any construction activities. If nesting birds are detected, a letter report or mitigation plan in conformance with the City's Biology Guidelines and applicable state and federal law (i.e., appropriate follow up surveys, monitoring schedules, construction and noise barriers/buffers, etc.) shall be prepared and include proposed measures to be implemented to ensure that take of birds or eggs or disturbance of breeding activities is avoided. The report or mitigation plan shall be submitted to the City for review and approval and implemented to the satisfaction of the City. The City's MMC Section and Biologist shall verify and approve that all measures identified in the report or mitigation plan are in place prior to and/or during construction.	
		F.	Resource Delineation - Prior to construction activities, the	

Table ES-2 Summary of Significant Environmental Impacts				
				Impact Level
Environmental Issue	Results of Impact Analysis		Mitigation	After Mitigation
			Qualified Biologist shall	
			supervise the placement of	
			orange construction fencing or	
			equivalent along the limits of	
			disturbance adjacent to	
			sensitive biological habitats	
			and verify compliance with any	
			other project conditions as	
			shown on the BCME. This	
			phase shall include flagging	
			plant specimens and delimiting	
			buffers to protect sensitive	
			biological resources (e.g.,	
			habitats/flora & fauna species,	
			including nesting birds) during	
			construction. Appropriate	
			steps/care should be taken to	
			minimize attraction of nest	
			predators to the site.	
		G.	Education - Prior to	
			commencement of	
			construction activities, the	
			Qualified Biologist shall meet	
			with the owner/permittee or	
			designee and the construction	
			crew and conduct an on-site	
			educational session regarding	
			the need to avoid impacts	
			outside of the approved	
			construction area and to	
			protect sensitive flora and	

Table ES-2 Summary of Significant Environmental Impacts					
Environmental Issue	Results of Impact Analysis	Impact LevelMitigationAfter Mitigation			
		fauna (e.g., explain the avian and wetland buffers, flag system for removal of invasive species or retention of sensitive plants, and clarify acceptable access routes/methods and staging areas, etc.).			
		<ul> <li>II. During Construction</li> <li>A. Monitoring - All construction         <ul> <li>(including access/staging areas)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>			
		shall be restricted to areas previously identified, proposed			
		for development/staging, or previously disturbed as shown on "Exhibit A" and/or the BCME.			
		The Qualified Biologist shall monitor construction activities as needed to ensure that			
		construction activities do not encroach into biologically sensitive areas, or cause other			
		similar damage, and that the work plan has been amended			
		to accommodate any sensitive species located during the pre-construction surveys. In			
		addition, the Qualified Biologist shall document field activity via			
		the Consultant Site Visit Record (CSVR). The CSVR shall be e-			

Table ES-2 Summary of Significant Environmental Impacts				
Environmental Issue	Results of Impact Analysis	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation	
		mailed to MMC on the 1st d of monitoring, the 1st week each month, the last day of monitoring, and immediate the case of any undocumen condition or discovery.	of y in	
		<ul> <li>B. Subsequent Resource Identification - The Qualified Biologist shall note/act to prevent any new disturband to habitat, flora, and/or faur onsite (e.g., flag plant specimens for avoidance during access, etc.). If active nests or other previously unknown sensitive resource are detected, all project activities that directly impact the resource shall be delayed until species specific local, s or federal regulations have been determined and applied by the Qualified Biologist.</li> </ul>	es a s t d aate	
		III. Post Construction Measures A. In the event that impacts exceed previously allowed amounts, additional impact shall be mitigated in accordance with City Biolog Guidelines, ESL and MSCP,		
		State CEQA, and other		

Table ES-2 Summary of Significant Environmental Impacts				
Environmental Issue	Results of Impact Analysis	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation	
		applicable local, state and federal law. The Qualified Biologist shall submit a final BCME/report to the satisfaction of the City ADD/MMC within 30 days of construction completion.		
HISTORICAL RESOURCES			·	
Would the project result in the alteration, including the adverse physical or aesthetic effects and/or the destruction of a prehistoric or historic building (including an architecturally significant building), structure, or object or site?	There is potential for significant subsurface cultural deposits to be uncovered and destroyed during grading, thereby resulting in a significant impact.	Mitigation for impacts to historical resources would include archaeological monitoring during construction as detailed in the procedures outlined in <b>HIST-1</b> in Section 4.4 of this EIR and in Table 10-1 of the MMRP.	Less than Significant	
PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES			• •	
Would the project require over 1,000 cubic yards of excavation in a high resource potential formation or over 2,000 cubic yards of excavation in a moderate resource potential formation that would result in the loss of significant paleontological resources?	The project has the potential to result in significant impacts to paleontological resources due to grading within formations with the potential to contain significant paleontological resources.	Mitigation for impacts to paleontological resources would include paleontological monitoring during construction as detailed in the procedures outlined in <b>PALEO-1</b> in Section 4.5 of this EIR and in Table 10-1 of the MMRP.	Less than Significant	



# Chapter 1 Introduction

This Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) updates the certified (No. 91-0360, adopted in 1993) Eli Lilly/IVAC Campus Point Planned Industrial Development Final Environmental Impact Report ("1993 FEIR") and an Addendum to this EIR for Qualcomm Building "AA" Planned Industrial Development Permit City Manager Resolution No. D-484 (City of San Diego 1997a). The SEIR addresses the potential environmental effects of the proposed Campus Point project (project). It has been prepared by the City of San Diego (City) in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and Guidelines (Public Resources Code, Section 21000 et seq. and California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Section 15000, et seq.) and in accordance with the City of San Diego's EIR Guidelines (City of San Diego 2005) and Significance Determination Thresholds (City of San Diego 2011).

The site is currently occupied by two existing scientific research buildings (CP1 and CP2) and associated utility structures that would remain. CP1 is a two-story 463,791-square-foot multi-tenant scientific research building with a 9,044-square-foot utility structure located at 10300 Campus Point Drive. CP2 is a 267,934-square-foot scientific research building with a 7,310-square-foot utility structure located at 10290 Campus Point Drive. The project proposes to construct two new buildings (CP3 and CP4), and a parking structure on the 58.19-acre project site. The tiered 6- and 12-level CP3 building would also be used for scientific research and would total 318,383 square feet plus a 44,000-square-foot subterranean level. The proposed 10,000-square-foot CP4 building is intended for use as a restaurant ("Alexhaus") plus a retail component on the first floor and a greenhouse, conference room, mechanical/storage space, and clubhouse on the second floor. CP4 would be located just east of proposed CP3. The proposed 6-level parking structure would accommodate a total of 1,500 parking stalls and would be located southeast of CP3 and CP4.

The project would be completed in two phases. The first phase focuses on the southeastern portion of the property to include the construction of CP4 and some landscaping/parking improvements. The second phase would construct the remainder of the project to include CP3 and the 9-level parking structure (6 levels aboveground and 3 subterranean). At full buildout, the site would have a

total floor area of 1,060,108 square feet. Parking spaces would peak at 2,909 with a parking ratio of 2.74 spaces per 1,000 square feet. The site is located in the University Community Plan (UCP) area.

Discretionary actions required to implement the project include:

- Community Plan Amendment (CPA) Required for modifications to the UCP.
- Site Development Permit (SDP) Required for development in the Community Plan Implementation Overlay Zone (CPIOZ) Type A and B of the UCP; required for Environmentally Sensitive Lands (ESL) because the project does not meet the exemption criteria in Land Development Code (LDC), Section 143.0110.
- Neighborhood Development Permit (NDP) Required for alternative calculation for the maximum intensity allowed within the Accident Potential Zone (APZ) II zone for Marine Corps Air Station (MCAS) Miramar.

## **1.1 SEIR Purpose and Intended Uses**

This SEIR is intended to inform decision-makers, public agencies, and the public about the potential significant adverse environmental impacts of the project and provide decision-makers with an understanding of the associated physical and environmental changes prior to taking action on the project. The SEIR includes recommended mitigation measures which, when implemented, would lessen project impacts and provide the City with ways to substantially lessen or avoid significant effects of the project on the environment, whenever feasible. Alternatives to the project are presented to evaluate scenarios that further reduce or avoid significant impacts associated with the project.

# 1.2 SEIR Legal Authority

#### 1.2.1 Lead Agency

The City of San Diego is the Lead Agency for the project pursuant to Article 4 (Sections 15050 and 15051) of the CEQA Guidelines. The Lead Agency, as defined by CEQA Guidelines Section 15367, is the public agency that has the principal responsibility and authority for carrying out or approving the project. As Lead Agency, the City of San Diego Development Services Department, Environmental Analysis Section conducted a preliminary review of the proposed development and determined that this SEIR was required. The analysis and findings in this document reflect the independent, impartial conclusions of the City.

#### 1.2.2 Responsible and Trustee Agencies

State law requires that all EIRs be reviewed by responsible and trustee agencies. A Responsible Agency, defined pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15381, includes all public agencies other than the Lead Agency that have discretionary approval power over the project. A Trustee Agency is defined in Section 15386 of the CEQA Guidelines as a state agency having jurisdiction by law over natural resources affected by a project that are held in trust for the people of the state of California.

Implementation of the project would require consultation with the following responsible and trustee agencies, as described below.

**San Diego County Regional Airport Authority (SDCRAA):** The project site is located in the Airport Influence Area (AIA) for MCAS Miramar, an area in which current or future airport-related noise, overflight, safety, or airspace protection factors may significantly affect land uses or necessitate restrictions on those uses. Safety zones are established for the purpose of evaluating the safety compatibility of land use and development in the AIA. The project site is within a safety zone designated APZ II. Therefore, a consistency determination from the SDCRAA would be required.

**San Diego County Air Pollution Control District (SDAPCD):** The SDAPCD, which is an agency that regulates sources of air pollution within San Diego County, would be responsible for issuing permits for construction and operation of the project.

**San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB):** The RWQCB regulates water quality through the Section 401 certification process and oversees the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit No. CA 0108758, which consists of wastewater discharge requirements. The RWQCB would be a Trustee Agency that holds regional water quality in its trust through the NPDES compliance review process.

**California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW):** The CDFW has jurisdiction over sensitive wildlife that is held in trust for the people of California. The CDFW would be a Trustee Agency for the proposed project, as sensitive wildlife has the potential to occur in the project vicinity.

# **1.3 SEIR Scope and Content and Format**

#### 1.3.1 Type of SEIR

This SEIR has been prepared as a Project SEIR, as defined in Section 15163 of the CEQA Guidelines. In accordance with CEQA, this Project SEIR examines the environmental impacts of a specific development project and focuses on the physical changes in the environment that would result from the project, including all phases of planning, construction, and operation.

This SEIR tiers to the certified (No. 91-0360) 1993 FEIR. In doing so, this SEIR addresses issues which, due to substantial changes in the project or surrounding circumstances, or due to new information which could not have been known earlier, would require major revisions of the 1993 EIR.

#### 1.3.2 Scope

The analysis in this document evaluates the adequacy of the 1993 FEIR relative to the approval of the project. The scope of analysis for this SEIR was determined by the City of San Diego as a result of initial project review.

This SEIR serves as a supplement to the previously certified 1993 FEIR, as referenced above. All environmental issues analyzed in the 1993 FEIR were considered during initial review of the project.

The following issues were determined to either: (1) lack a site-specific impact analysis and adequate mitigation for project impacts; or (2) result in new impacts that may be potentially significant and require subsequent analysis and/or mitigation as part of this SEIR:

- Land Use
- Transportation/Circulation
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Paleontological Resources
- Visual Quality/Neighborhood Character

These issues are discussed in detail in Chapter 4 of this SEIR. This SEIR provides project-specific environmental review pursuant to CEQA and the City's Significance Determination Thresholds (2011). The analysis identifies environmental effects specific to the project and appropriate mitigation, when warranted.

Chapter 8 of this SEIR, Subject Areas Requiring No Change in Analysis, contains a summary of the impacts of the project compared with the impacts analyzed in the 1993 FEIR.

Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions were not addressed in the 1993 FEIR. The issue of GHG is not addressed in this SEIR as the courts have established that climate change and GHG do not constitute "new information" because the effects of GHG on climate change were known when the EIR was certified in 1993 and therefore do not have to be addressed as "new information" in a SEIR (Citizens Against Airport Pollution v. City of San Jose (2014) 227 Cal. App. 4th 788, 806-808).

A comparison of the project to the 1993 FEIR is provided in Table 1-1. The project would implement applicable mitigation measures included in the 1993 FEIR and/or this SEIR, as indicated in the table.

Table 1-1						
Impact Assessment Summary 1993 FEIR						
Issue Area/Threshold 4.1 Land Use	1993 IVAC FEIR Conclusion	New or Substantially Increased Impact?	New and/or Previous Mitigation)?	Resultant Project Impact after Mitigation?		
Plan Consistency	Significant unmitigated	Yes	No	Eliminated through the Plan Amendment		
MSCP/MHPA Consistency	N/A	Yes	New	Less than significant		
General Plan Noise/ Land Use Compatibility	N/A	No	No	Less than significant		
MCAS Miramar ALUCP Compatibility	Less than significant	No	No	Less than significant		
LDC Compliance	N/A	No	No	Less than significant		
4.2 Traffic	Γ	Γ	1	-		
Direct	Significant unmitigated	Yes	New	Significant unmitigated		
Cumulative	Significant unmitigated	Yes	New	Less than significant		
4.3 Biological Resources	Less than Significant	Yes	New	Less than significant		
4.4 Cultural Resources	Less than significant	Yes	New	Less than significant		
4.5 Paleontological Resources	N/A	Yes	New	Less than Significant		
4.6 Landform Alteration/Visua		I	I			
Landform Alteration	Less than significant	No	No	Less than significant		
Public Views	Less than significant	No	No	Less than significant		
Neighborhood Character	Less than significant	No	No	Less than significant		
Light/Glare	N/A	No	No	Less than significant		
Noise	Γ	I	T			
Operational/Ambient	Less than significant	No	No	Less than significant		
Traffic	Significant unmitigated	No	No	Less than significant		
Construction	N/A	No	No	Less than significant		
Air Quality	Γ	I	T			
Direct Impacts (Traffic)	Significant unmitigated	No	No	Less than significant		
Cumulative Impacts (Traffic)	Significant unmitigated	No	No	Less than significant		
Plan Conformance	N/A	No	No	Less than significant		
Operational	N/A	No	No	Less than significant		
Health and Safety/Hazardous		I	1			
Fire safety	Less than significant	No	No	Less than significant		
Airport Hazards	N/A	No	No	Less than significant		
Hazardous Materials	Less than significant	No	No	Less than significant		
Hydrology/Water Quality						
Hydrology	Less than significant	No	No	Less than significant		
Water quality	Significant mitigated	No	No	Less than significant		
Geologic Conditions	Less than significant	No	No	Less than significant		
Public Services and Facilities	N/A	No	No	Less than significant		
Public Utilities	N/A	No	No	Less than significant		
Agricultural Resources	N/A	No	No	Less than significant		
Mineral Resources	N/A	No	No	Less than significant		
Energy Conservation	N/A	No	No	Less than significant		
Population and Housing	N/A	No	No	Less than significant		
N/A = This issue or threshold wa	-					
MSCP = Multiple Species Conservation Program; MHPA = Multi-Habitat Planning Area						

#### 1.3.3 SEIR Analysis Content

This SEIR determines whether implementation of the project would have a significant effect on the environment through analysis of the issues identified during the scoping process (see Section 1.3.2). Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15126, all phases of the project are considered in this SEIR when evaluating its potential impacts on the environment, including the planning, acquisition, development, and operation phases. Impacts are identified as direct or indirect, short-term or long-term, and assessed on a "plan-to-ground" basis. The "plan-to-ground" analysis addresses the changes or impacts that would result from implementation of the project compared to existing ground conditions.

#### 1.3.4 SEIR Format

#### 1.3.4.1 Organization

The format and order of contents of this SEIR follow the direction of the City's EIR Guidelines. A brief overview of the various chapters of this SEIR is provided below:

**Executive Summary.** Provides a summary of the SEIR and a brief description of the project, identifies areas of controversy, and includes a summary table identifying significant impacts, mitigation measures (new and from the 1993 FEIR), and impact conclusion after mitigation. A summary of the analyzed project alternatives and comparison of the potential impacts of the alternatives with those of the project is also provided.

**Chapter 1 Introduction.** Contains an overview of the purpose and intended uses of the SEIR; identifies the Lead, Responsible, and Trustee agencies; summarizes the SEIR scope and content; and details the CEQA environmental review process.

**Chapter 2 Environmental Setting.** Provides a description of the project's regional context, location, and existing physical characteristics and land use. Available public infrastructure and services, as well as relationship to relevant plans, are also provided in this chapter.

**Chapter 3 Project Description.** Provides a detailed discussion of the project, including background, objectives, key features, off-site components, and environmental design considerations. A description of the discretionary actions required to implement the project is also included.

**Chapter 4 Environmental Analysis.** Provides a detailed evaluation of potential environmental impacts of the project. In accordance with the City's EIR Guidelines, Chapter 4 begins with the issue of land use, followed by the remaining issues included in order of significance. Under each issue area, this chapter includes a summary of the issue as analyzed in the 1993 FEIR; followed by a description of the existing conditions relevant to each environmental topic including the regulatory framework; presentation of threshold(s) of significance based on the City of San Diego's CEQA Significance Determination Thresholds for the particular issue area under evaluation; identification of an issue statement; an assessment of any impacts associated with implementation of the project; a conclusion as to the significance of any project impacts; and recommendations for mitigation measures and mitigation monitoring and reporting, as appropriate, for each significant issue area.

Where mitigation measures are required, a statement regarding the significance of the impact after mitigation is additionally provided.

**Chapter 5 Significant Unavoidable Environmental Effects/Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes.** Discusses the significant unavoidable impacts of the project, including those that can be mitigated but not reduced to below a level of significance. This chapter also describes the potentially significant irreversible changes that may be expected with development of the project and addresses the use of nonrenewable resources during its construction and operational life.

**Chapter 6 Growth Inducement.** Evaluates the potential influence the project may have on economic or population growth within the project area as well as the region, either directly or indirectly.

**Chapter 7 Cumulative Impacts.** Identifies the impacts of the project in combination with other planned and future development in the region.

**Chapter 8 Subject Areas Requiring No Change in Analysis.** The analysis and conclusions reached in a number of the environmental subject areas contained within the 1993 FEIR do not require supplemental analysis and are not addressed in detail in Chapter 5 of this SEIR. These issues are briefly summarized in this chapter.

**Chapter 9 Project Alternatives.** Provides a description of two alternatives to the project, including a No Project/No Development Alternative and a Reduced Project Alternative.

**Chapter 10 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.** Documents all the mitigation measures identified in the 1993 FEIR and this SEIR that are required to be implemented as part of the project.

Chapter 11 References Cited. Lists all of the reference materials cited in the SEIR.

**Chapter 12 Individuals and Agencies Consulted.** Identifies all of the individuals and agencies contacted during preparation of the SEIR.

**Chapter 13 Certification.** Identifies all of the agencies, organizations, and individuals responsible for the preparation of the SEIR.

#### 1.3.4.2 Technical Appendices

Technical appendices, used as a basis for much of the environmental analysis in the SEIR, have been summarized in the SEIR and are printed under separate cover as part of the SEIR. The technical appendices are available for review at the City of San Diego Development Services Center, 1222 First Avenue, Fifth Floor, San Diego, California 92101.

#### **1.3.4.3** Incorporation by Reference

As permitted by CEQA Guidelines Section 15150, this SEIR incorporates by reference previously certified EIR (No. 91-0360) and approved plans, which provide supporting documentation used in the analysis for the project. This SEIR also references several technical studies and reports, including the City of San Diego General Plan and EIR (2008) and the University Community Plan (1987 and as amended in 1990, 1998, 2006, and 2011). Information from these documents has been briefly summarized in this SEIR, and their relationship to this SEIR described. These documents are included in Chapter 11, References Cited, and are hereby incorporated by reference. They are available for review at the City of San Diego Development Services Center, 1222 First Avenue, Fifth Floor, San Diego, California 92101.

## 1.4 SEIR Process

The SEIR review process occurs in two basic stages. The first stage is the Draft SEIR, which offers the public the opportunity to comment on the document, while the second stage is the Final SEIR, which provides the basis for approving the project.

#### 1.4.1 Draft SEIR

In accordance with Sections 15085 and 15087 (a) (1) of the CEQA Guidelines, upon completion of the Draft SEIR a Notice of Completion is filed with the State Office of Planning and Research, and a notice of availability of the Draft SEIR is issued in a newspaper of general circulation in the area.

The Draft SEIR is distributed for review to the public, and interested and affected agencies for the purpose of providing comments "on the sufficiency of the document in identifying and analyzing the possible impacts on the environment and ways in which the significant effects of the project might be avoided or mitigated" (Section 15204, CEQA Guidelines).

This Draft SEIR and all related technical studies are available for review during the public review period at the offices of the City of San Diego, Development Services Department, Entitlements Division, located at 1222 First Avenue, Fifth Floor, San Diego, California 92101. Copies of the Draft SEIR are also available at the following public locations:

- San Diego Public Library, Central Library, 330 Park Boulevard, San Diego, California 92101-7416
- North University Community Library, 8820 Judicial Drive, San Diego, California 92122

The Draft SEIR can be downloaded from the City's website at: https://www.sandiego.gov/cityclerk/officialdocs/notices/.

#### 1.4.2 Final SEIR

Following public review of the Draft SEIR, the City would provide written responses to comments per CEQA Guidelines Section 15088 and would consider all comments in making its decision to certify

the Final SEIR. Responses to the comments received during public review, a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, and Findings of Fact would be included with the Final SEIR. If no new significant and unmitigated impacts are identified for the project, then the City shall re-adopt the Statement of Overriding Considerations adopted in conjunction with the 1993 FEIR.

The culmination of this process is a public hearing where the City Council would determine whether to certify the Final SEIR as being complete and in accordance with CEQA. Pursuant to Section 128.0310(a) of the City of San Diego Land Development Code, the Final SEIR would be available for public review for at least 14 calendar days before the first public hearing or discretionary action on the project.

# 2

# Chapter 2 Environmental Setting

# 2.1 Regional Setting

The project site is located within the City of San Diego, San Diego County (Figure 2-1), in proximity to the University of California at San Diego (UCSD), Torrey Pines State Park, Mira Mesa Boulevard, and Miramar Corps Air Stations (MCAS) Miramar. The project site lies inland approximately two miles from the Pacific Ocean situated between Interstate 5 (I-5) and I-805, approximately 0.5 mile south of the I-5 and I-805 merge (see Figure 2-1).

The 58.19-acre project site is located within the University Community Plan (UCP) area in the northwestern portion of the City. The UCP area encompasses approximately 8,500 acres and is generally bounded by Los Peñasquitos Lagoon and Torrey Pines on the north, Interstate 805 (I-805) and Mira Mesa on the east, State Route 52 (SR-52) on the south, and La Jolla and the Pacific Ocean on the west.

# 2.2 Project Setting

The site is located at the northern terminus of Campus Point Drive and includes assessor's parcel numbers (APNs) 343-230-13 and 343-230-14. The project site is in the unsectioned Pueblo Lands of San Diego land grant of the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) 7.5-minute topographic map, Del Mar quadrangle (Figure 2-2).

The UCP (adopted in 1987) is divided into subareas. The project site lies within the Central Subarea of the UCP, an area bounded by I-805, I-5, Genesee Road, Regents Road, La Jolla Village Drive, Gilman Drive, and an unnamed urban canyon. The project site is bound on the north by undeveloped land, on the west by a steep hillside adjacent to I-5, on the east by vacant land, and on the south by industrial development (Figure 2-3).






graphic map series. DEI

minute

Mar

MAR & LA JOLLA quadrangles, PUEBLO LANDS OF SAN DIEGO Landgrant

0 Feet 2,000



Project Site Off-site Improvement Area

> FIGURE 2-2 Project Location on USGS Map



Project Site

Off-site Improvement Area

FIGURE 2-3 Project Location on Aerial Photograph The site is currently developed with 731,725 square feet of industrial/scientific research and development space, surface parking, and landscaping. Environmentally Sensitive Lands (ESL) are present on-site consisting of sensitive biological resources and steep slopes on the north, west, and east slopes of the project site.

# 2.3 Physical Environment

#### 2.3.1 Land Use

The site is currently used for industrial/scientific research and development space. The northern portion of the project site at 10300 Campus Point Drive occupies approximately 42 acres and includes the existing Campus Point (formerly IVAC) building. The original building was constructed by ministerial action in 1979 at 326,980 square feet in size. It was subsequently expanded several times in 1982, 1999, and 2007 bringing the structure to its current configuration and size at 463,791 square feet.

The southern portion of the project site at 10290 Campus Point Drive occupies approximately 17 acres and includes an approximately 267,934-square-foot building that houses primarily scientific research and development uses. This structure was built subsequent to the certification of the 1993 FEIR and is currently undergoing interior and exterior renovations pursuant to existing approvals granted by the City on October 13, 2015 (project number 437205 and building permit number 15-29540-B). Both the northern and southern portion of the project site has an existing utility/central plant structure serving each of the existing on-site structures. These structures are roofed and normally unoccupied except for the occasional maintenance personnel.

The remainder of the developed portion of the project site is primarily surface parking and landscaping. Land on the north, west, and east sides of the project site slope downward and consist of sensitive biological resources and steep slopes.

#### 2.3.2 Transportation

The regional transportation network in the project area consists of I-5 to the west, I-805 to the east, and SR-52 to the south. Campus Point Drive, which runs north-south, is the only point of entry to the project site. Genesee Avenue runs southeast-northwest in the project vicinity and provides access to Campus Point Drive from I-5.

The nearest Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) bus stop is at Genesee Avenue and Campus Point Drive, three-quarters of a mile from the project site. MTS route 979 serves this location, which runs from the intersection of Genesee Avenue and La Jolla Village Drive to the Sorrento Valley Coaster Station during the weekday peak travel hours (i.e., 6:30–9:00 a.m. and 4:00–6:30 p.m.).

Class II bike lanes exist on Genesee Avenue between I-5 and La Jolla Village Drive. Class III bike routes with "sharrows" are provided on Campus Point Drive between Genesee Avenue and Campus Point Court. Sidewalks exist on both sides of Campus Point Drive from Genesee Avenue northwards to its terminus.

#### 2.3.3 Topography/Landform

The project area is topographically diverse, ranging from the rolling ridges and side canyons near an unnamed urban canyon through mesa areas near Eastgate Mall, to the precipitous canyon edges overlooking Sorrento Valley.

The project site is located on a mesa. Although the perimeter of the project site has slopes up to 130 feet tall, the core of the site is relatively flat. The site has a maximum elevation of approximately 302 feet above mean sea level (AMSL). The lowest part of the graded area is at the southwest boundary of the site at around 295 feet AMSL. The mesa falls off steeply on the northwest, northeast, east, and south. The developed portion of the project site contains slopes of 0 to 15 percent grade.

ESLs are present on-site and consist of sensitive biological resources and steep slopes (greater than 25 percent slopes) on the northwestern and southeastern ends of the project site. A portion of the steep slope on the northwestern end of the property is a manufactured slope that has been stabilized with terraces and, therefore, is not categorized as ESL. The slope on the southeast end of the property is also considered a steep slope and is within the Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA) (see Figure 2-8, later in this chapter).

The project site primarily consists of urban/developed areas (40.08 acres), but also contains eucalyptus woodland (5.34 acres). Urban/developed areas have been built or disturbed to the extent that native vegetation is no longer supported. These areas are characterized by the presence of large permanent structures, pavement, and irrigated landscaping.

Naturalized vegetation communities on-site consist of Diegan coastal sage scrub (8.74 acres) and nonnative grassland (4.25 acres). Diegan coastal sage scrub (coastal form) is a drought-deciduous, subshrub community. This community on the project site is predominantly coastal sagebrush with laurel sumac (*Malosma laurina*), lemonadeberry (*Rhus integrifolia*), and coyote bush (*Baccharis pilularis*). Nonnative grasslands are generally dominated by annual grasses in association with annual forbs. Rip-gut brome (*Bromus diandrus*) with wild oat (*Avena fatua*), red brome (*Bromus madritensis rubens*), and black mustard (*Brassica nigra*) occur within the non-native grassland on-site.

#### 2.3.4 Drainage

The project site lies within a portion of several existing on-site drainage basins, currently draining to three separate points of concentration. The first point of concentration is to the west. Drainage from the westerly side of the site flows into a 24-inch storm drain. The storm drain flows to the west down the slope before being discharged at the bottom of the canyon.

The second point of discharge is to the southeast. Drainage from the easterly portion of the access road flows to the east, and then to the south on the east side of the existing building. The drainage then flows off-site within the City of San Diego storm drain within Campus Point Drive.

The third point of discharge is to the south through a public storm drain that leaves the site to the south. The storm drain leaves the site midway in the lot along the south side.

#### 2.3.5 Air Quality/Climate

The project area is within the San Diego Air Basin (SDAB), as defined by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) and San Diego Air Pollution Control District (SDAPCD). The eastern portion of the SDAB is surrounded by mountains to the north, east, and south. These mountains tend to restrict airflow and concentrate pollutants in the valleys and low-lying areas.

The project area, like the rest of San Diego County's coastal areas, has a Mediterranean climate characterized by warm, dry summers and mild, wet winters. The dominant meteorological feature affecting the region is the Pacific High Pressure Zone, which produces the prevailing westerly to northwesterly winds. These winds tend to blow pollutants away from the coast toward the inland areas. Consequently, air quality near the coast is generally better than that which occurs at the base of the coastal mountain range.

The SDAPCD maintains 11 air quality monitoring stations throughout the greater San Diego metropolitan region. Air pollutant concentrations and meteorological information are continuously recorded at these stations. Measurements are then used by scientists to help forecast daily air pollution levels. Current measurements are discussed in detail in Section 8.5, Air Quality. The SDAB is classified as a federal and state non-attainment area for ozone and a state non-attainment area for particulate matter less than 10 microns (PM<sub>10</sub>), particulate matter less than 2.5 microns (PM<sub>2.5</sub>), and ozone, and a federal maintenance area for carbon monoxide (CO). Air pollutants transported into the basin from the adjacent South Coast Air Basin (encompassing Los Angeles and Orange counties) substantially contribute to the non-attainment conditions in the SDAB.

# 2.4 Public Utilities and Services

The following provides a brief description of the existing public utilities and services that currently serve the project site. Section 8.9 of this SEIR provides a more detailed discussion of public utilities, including evaluation of infrastructure capacity and project needs.

The Public Utilities Department (PUD) provides water service to the project site. The PUD maintains surface storage reservoirs, water treatment plants, and pump stations as part of their water system. The water system also includes transmission and distribution pipelines to deliver potable water to developed areas. The existing water distribution system includes a public 12-inch water main located in Campus Point Drive adjacent to the project site, which connects on-site to existing water mains. The project site also receives service from an existing recycled water main that is used for irrigation of on-site landscaping.

The PUD also provides wastewater collection, treatment, and disposal services to the San Diego region through its Metropolitan Sewerage System. An existing private 8-inch sewer main, also located in Campus Point Drive, connects to a private line on-site that currently serves the existing buildings. The private 8-inch lines discharge into the existing public 15-inch sewer main.

Fire protection services are provided by the City's Fire-Rescue Department, Fire Station 35 and Station 41. Station 35 serves University City and its surrounding areas and Station 41 serves Sorrento Valley and its surrounding areas. Both stations are approximately 1.25 miles from the project site.

Police services are provided by the City's Police Department, Northwestern Division at 12592 El Camino Real. City police services provide crime prevention and education, crime statistics and maps, as well as instructions on reporting emergencies and non-emergencies.

## 2.5 Planning Context

Development projects in the City are generally guided by the City's General Plan, and more specifically by the applicable community plan. In addition, various other City, regional, and state plans, programs, and ordinances regulate the development of land within San Diego. A brief description of each is provided below. A detailed evaluation of the project's consistency with relevant plans and ordinances is provided in Section 4.1, Land Use, of this EIR.

The City General Plan sets forth a comprehensive, long-term plan for development within the City. The General Plan (2008) has been updated since the 1993 project FEIR was certified. The 2008 General Plan incorporates a City of Villages strategy, which redirects development to areas with available urban amenities and includes the following 10 elements: Land Use and Community Planning; Mobility; Urban Design; Economic Prosperity; Public Facilities, Services, and Safety; Recreation; Conservation; Noise; Historic Preservation; and Housing. The site is designated as Industrial Employment and Open Space by the General Plan.

The UCP (adopted in 1987) establishes planning and development controls within the community. The Urban Design Element of the UCP provides a vision of the future character of the community, and makes recommendations regarding transportation linkages and urban design criteria for development in four subareas: Torrey Pines, Central, Miramar, and South University. The other plan elements establish policies relating to land use, transportation, and public facilities, among others. The UCP generally designates the project site for Open Space and Industrial uses (Figure 2-4), and the project site is within the Central Subarea.

The Development Intensity Element establishes subareas with specified land use and development intensities. As shown in Figure 2-5, the project site lies within Subarea 10, which is designated for "existing or approved development," with the following exceptions: IVAC [Alexandria 10290-10300 Campus Point Drive] and SAIC — 30,000 square feet per acre (sf/ac); Lot 7 (3.6 acres) — 18,000 sf/ac (scientific research); and 25 acres designated for Open Space. The Development Intensity Element Table 3 footnote 3 further states that "SAIC and IVAC [Alexandria – 10290 – 10300 Campus Point Drive] shall be required to mitigate their peak-hour trip generation rate to a level equal to or less than that which would be generated by a project of 18,000 sf/ac. Mitigation shall be achieved through a Transportation System Management (TSM) program to be approved by the City Council." As the project is located within the SAIC and IVAC area, this peak-hour trip generation rate mitigation requirement applies to the project. The proposed Community Plan Amendment will modify the peak-hour mitigation requirement to read: "Alexandria shall be required to mitigate its peak-hour trip generated by a project of 20,000 sf/ac." It is noted that the City also refers to a TSM program as Transportation Demand Management (TDM) and these two terms may be used interchangeably throughout this document.



M:\JOBS3\5230\env\graphics\EIR\fig2-5.ai

Project Site

Off-site Improvement Area

0

FIGURE 2-4

Existing Land Use Designation



Project Site Off-site Improvement Area 0

The UCP establishes the Community Plan Implementation Overlay Zone (CPIOZ), which provides supplemental development regulations that are tailored to specific sites within community plan areas of the City. The project site is within CPIOZ Types A and B, and the project includes a SDP accordingly (Figure 2-6). The intent of these regulations is to ensure that development proposals are reviewed for consistency with the use and development criteria that have been adopted for specific sites as part of the community plan update process.

The City's Municipal Code contains all the adopted ordinances for the City and is divided into 15 chapters. Chapters 11 through 14 are known collectively as the Land Development Code (LDC) and include applicable development regulations for the Base Zones of a project site, as well as supplemental development regulations contained within the applicable Overlay Zones. Regulations applicable to the project include Brush Management Regulations and ESL Regulations, which includes biological resources and steep hillsides and their associated guidelines.

The majority of the property is zoned IP-1-1 (Industrial Park), which allows research and development uses with some limited manufacturing. A small portion of the parcel near I-5 and the length of the parcel east of Campus Point Drive are zoned RS-1-14 (Residential Single-Family, minimum 5,000-square-foot lots) (Figure 2-7). The furthest eastern extent of the parcel is zoned RS-1-7 (Residential Single-Family, minimum 5,000-square-foot lots). These very low density residential zones were utilized as "holding zones," to preclude premature development. The project site is also subject to the City's ESL Regulations (LDC Section 143.0101, et. seq.) due to the presence of sensitive biological resources and steep hillsides on the property.

The Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) is a comprehensive program to preserve a network of habitat and open space in the region. One of the primary objectives of the MSCP is to identify and maintain a preserve system which allows for animals and plants to exist at both the local and regional levels. The City's MSCP Subarea Plan was approved in March 1997, subsequent to the certification of the 1993 FEIR.

The project site is wholly within the City's MSCP Subarea Plan for habitat conservation (Figure 2-8) and portions of the site have MHPA over them. These lands have been determined to provide the necessary habitat quality, quantity, and connectivity to sustain the unique biodiversity of the San Diego region. MHPA lands are considered by the City to be a sensitive biological resource. It is noted that a portion of the site included in the MHPA was already developed with a parking lot at the time the MHPA was implemented and these areas will be removed from the MHPA per the City's boundary line correction (BLC) process.

The Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) for MCAS Miramar, adopted October 2008, provides for the orderly growth of the airport and the area surrounding the airport, and safeguards the general welfare of the inhabitants within the vicinity of the airport and the public in general. The ALUCP defines the Airport Influence Area (AIA), or the area in which current or future airport-related noise, overflight, safety, or airspace protection factors may significantly affect land uses or necessitate restrictions on those uses. The project site is within the AIA for MCAS Miramar, the area in which current or future airport-related factors may affect land uses or necessitate restrictions on those uses. Safety zones are



Off-site Improvement Area

CPIOZ-A

CPIOZ-B

**FIGURE 2-6** University Community Plan Implementation Overlay Zone (CPIOZ)



RS-1-7

FIGURE 2-7 Existing Zoning





Project Site

4) 400 0 Feet

FIGURE 2-8 Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA) established for the purpose of evaluating the safety compatibility of land use and Community Plan Implementation Overlay Zone development in the AIA. The project site lies within a safety zone, Accident Potential Zone (APZ) II, as shown on Figure 2-9. Development in APZ-II is subject to land use compatibility and intensity restrictions.

Regional air quality plans provide an overview of the region's air quality and identify the pollution control measures needed to expeditiously attain and maintain air quality standards. The region's plans include the San Diego Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS), addressing state requirements, and the San Diego portion of the California State Implementation Plan (SIP), addressing federal requirements.

The Water Quality Control Plan for the San Diego Basin (Basin Plan) was prepared by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Diego Region to identify beneficial uses for water bodies in the San Diego region, and establishes water quality objectives and implementation plans to protect those beneficial uses. This plan was prepared pursuant to the Clean Water Act and the California Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act requirements. Within the Basin Plan area, the project site is located in the Los Peñasquitos Hydrologic Unit (906) and part of the Miramar Reservoir Hydrologic Area (906.10).



Project Site Off-site Improvement Area

MCAS Miramar Safety Zones

Accident Potential Zone 2 **Transition Zone** 

> **FIGURE 2-9** Safety Zones for MCAS Miramar

# 3

# Chapter 3 Project Description

# 3.1 Project Background

The existing Campus Point (formerly IVAC) building was constructed on the site in 1979, by ministerial action. The project site was subdivided into two parcels in 1981 by Parcel Map No. 10898. Parcel 1 (containing existing 463,791-square-foot CP1 building) is approximately 41.67 acres and Parcel 2 containing existing 267,934-square-foot CP2 building) is approximately 16.52 acres. A Master Planned Industrial Development (PID) (No. 91-0360) was approved for the project site by the Planning Commission on March 23, 1993. An EIR was certified in conjunction with the PID and Vesting Tentative Map. Significant environmental impacts were identified for traffic, air quality, land use, noise, hydrology/water quality, and safety/hazardous materials. At the request of the property owner (Qualcomm, Inc.), the PID was subsequently canceled by the Director of Development Services on May 31, 1996 via the Development Services Director Resolution No. D-405 (City of San Diego 1996). Thus, the proposed intensification of the site from (then) 379,000 square feet to 1,209,000 square feet did not occur. Following the cancellation, an Addendum to EIR No. 91-0360 was approved in 1997 (City of San Diego 1997) for a PID permit to allow the development of CP2 on the 16.52-acre site. At this time the 41.67-acre 10300 Campus Point Drive property contained the existing 463,791-square-foot structure (CP1) and the 16.52-acre 10290 Campus Point Drive property contained the existing 267,934-square-foot structure (CP2). The proposed Site Development Permit (SDP) provides a comprehensive master plan for the development of the two parcels as one combined 58.19-acre project.

As discussed in greater detail below in Section 3.6, FEIR No. 91-0360 was certified in 1993 for the Eli Lilly/IVAC Campus Point Planned Industrial Development (PID; hereafter 1993 FEIR). While the PID was cancelled in 1996, the current proposal covers the same 58.19-acre project site that was analyzed in the 1993 FEIR. The current proposal of 1,060,108 square feet is 148,892 square feet less than what was certified in the 1993 FEIR. At the time that the 1993 FEIR was certified, the building now referred to as CP1 existed as the 379,000-square-foot IVAC building, but CP2 had not been constructed (CP2 was subsequently constructed per the 1997 EIR Addendum, PID No. 96-0743).

Figure 3-1 shows the site plan presented in the 1993 FEIR; as shown, Lot 7 is reserved for the existing IVAC building, Lots 1-5 would accommodate five individual scientific research (SR) buildings adjacent to a joint-use parking structure. Lots 6 and 8 were anticipated to be used for an expansion of the IVAC facility or for other SR uses. Lot 9 encompassed the Private Streets 'A' and 'B'. The remainder of the site was reserved as open space within either dedicated non-building easements or open space easements. In 1993, this included approximately 11.2 acres of natural open space and 7.5 acres of manufactured slopes adjacent to Interstate 5.

# 3.2 **Project Objectives**

In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15124, the following primary objectives support the purpose of the project, assist the Lead Agency in developing a reasonable range of alternatives to be evaluated in this SEIR, and ultimately aid decision makers in preparing findings and overriding considerations, if necessary.

- Provide the region with additional job opportunities in the life science and biotech industries.
- Intensify existing industrial/research uses in a manner that provides a campus-like environment with comprehensive site design and substantial landscaping.
- Enhance the access, orientation, and walkability of the existing site.
- Use the site in a way that would contribute to regional goals to reduce vehicle use and promote alternative transportation use by providing a facility within a convenient distance of present and future alternative transportation facilities.
- Create a coherent and cohesive building and site design that is compatible in scale and character and enhances the existing community character in the University Community Plan (UCP).

## 3.3 **Project Components**

#### 3.3.1 Development Plan

The proposed project entails intensifying an existing 731,725-square-foot scientific research and development facility by 328,383 square feet; thereby creating a 1,060,108-square-foot science and business park, characterized by a campus-like environment with comprehensive site design and substantial landscaping. The project would add two new buildings and an associated parking structure within previously disturbed land that is currently occupied by surface parking (Figure 3-2). The project involves the redevelopment of the existing scientific research and development property with additional buildings and accessory uses in order to provide for a campus-like science and business park with comprehensive site design and substantial landscaping. The project would entail the construction of a 12- and 6-story split-level multi-tenant building (CP3), a 2-story building housing a micro-brewery with accessory dining space and shared tenant amenity spaces (CP4), and an 9-level (including 6 aboveground and 3 subterranean levels) parking structure to accommodate 1,455 parking stalls within the 58.19-acre project site. The project also includes a loading



#### FIGURE 3-1 Site Plan for the 1993 PID & FEIR



Proposed SDP

Ministerial Projects Under Construction or in Process

Existing Infrastructure in Blue Font Proposed Infrastructure in Purple Font Feet 150

#### FIGURE 3-2

Illustrative Site Plan



FIGURE 3-3 Site Plan dock/utility area, landscaping and site improvements, and a reconfiguration of parking areas and internal circulation through the site. As shown in Table 3-1, the total floor area of the site would not exceed 1,060,108 square feet (including the existing 731,725 square footage for buildings CP1 and CP2). As shown in Figure 3-3, a majority of the proposed structures and improvements would be constructed in the southwest quadrant of the project site in the location of existing surface parking. The proposed CP3 research and development building would be located at the southwestern end of the property. The 2-story CP4 amenity structure would be located just east of the proposed building CP3 in the southwestern portion of the site. The parking garage would be located at the southern end of the project site, just south and east of proposed building CP4. A new loading dock/utility area and trash/recycle area would be located south of building CP3. Minor improvements to the trash enclosure area would also be completed in the northern portion of the site, north of the existing building CP1. The buildings have been designed to achieve Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Silver, which requires several energy- and insulation-efficiency measures to be included in the design of the structures.

The main 12- and 6-story split-level building (CP3) would contain 318,383 square feet of scientific research and development space, including a 44,000-square-foot below-grade basement level and a top floor penthouse. Building CP3 would be 195 feet tall (including the mechanical screening). Exterior treatments include a combination of aluminum and glass precast concrete and terracotta. Refer to Figures 3-4a and b for elevations and cross sections.

The 2-story, 10,000-square-foot, 31-foot 10-inch structure (building CP4) would contain amenities for employees. The structure would include a micro-brewery, with accessory dining space and shared tenant amenity spaces. Refer to Figures 3-5a and b for elevations and cross sections of CP4.

A loading dock/utility and trash/recycle area would be located just south of building CP3 at the southwest corner of the project site. Improvements to the trash/recycle enclosure area located north of building CP1 would also be completed. There are currently 2,574 surface parking spaces on-site. As shown in Table 3-1 below, a total of 2,909 parking spaces are proposed based upon a parking ratio of 2.74 spaces per 1,000 square feet. This includes 1,448 existing stalls that would remain, 7 new surface stalls and 1,440 stalls that would be provided in a 9-level parking structure (6 levels above ground, 3 below ground). The height of the parking structure would be 51 feet, 11 inches above grade. Refer to Figure 3-6 for cross sections of the parking garage. Surface parking areas located in the southeastern portion of the site and north of building CP3 would be reconfigured to accommodate proposed internal circulation improvements.

No development is proposed for the northern portion of the site, with the exception of improvements to the trash/recycle area north of building CP1. All improvements would be located within existing developed areas, within the existing parking lot boundary. No development is proposed on any of the steep slopes surrounding the developed portion of the site. Refer to Figure 3-7.





BUILDING CP3 - NORTH ELEVATION

1

2



BUILDING CP3 - EAST ELEVATION







FIGURE 3-4b

**CP3 Cross Sections** 

M:\JOBS3\5230\env\graphics\SEIR\fig3-4b.ai 06/30/16 ccn



#### FIGURE 3-5a CP4 Elevations













FIGURE 3-5b

**CP4 Cross Sections** 

M:\JOBS3\5230\env\graphics\SEIR\fig3-5b.ai 06/30/16 ccn





FIGURE 3-6 Parking Structure Elevations





Project Site

Off-site Improvement Area

City of San Diego MHPA

Boundary Line Correction (Approved November 17, 2014)

MHPA Addition

Brush Management Zone 2

Off-site Boundary Line Correction

#### FIGURE 3-7

Limits of Work and Brush Management Zones

Table 3-1 Project Development Summary				
Туре	Amount			
Buildings				
Existing Building CP1	463,791			
Existing Building CP2	267,934			
Existing Central Plant CP1-1	9,044 <sup>1</sup>			
Existing Central Plant CP2-1	7,310 <sup>1</sup>			
Proposed Building CP3	318,383 sf above-grade 44,000 sf below-grade <sup>1</sup>			
Proposed Building CP4	10,000 sf			
TOTAL PROPOSED SF <sup>2</sup>	<b>328,383</b> <sup>2</sup>			
TOTAL EXISTING + PROPOSED SF <sup>2</sup>	<b>1,060,108</b> <sup>2</sup>			
Parking				
Existing Surface Stalls	2,574 stalls			
Existing Surface Stalls to Remain	1,462 stalls (1,126 surface stalls to be eliminated)			
Proposed Surface Stalls	7 stalls			
Proposed Six-Story Parking Structure with	1,440 stalls			
three subterranean levels	(471 subterranean, 969 above grade)			
TOTAL PROPOSED	1,447			
TOTAL EXISTING + PROPOSED	2,909 stalls			
Landscaping				
10290 Campus Point Drive	275,079 sf			
10300 Campus Point Drive	902,930 sf			
TOTAL EXISTING + PROPOSED	1,178,009 sf (46% of gross)			
<sup>1</sup> Not counted toward development intensity ca <sup>2</sup> Total includes square footage considered	in development intensity calculation			

Excludes the unoccupied utility/central plant structures and the 44,000 sf of below grade square footage included with building CP3.

sf = square feet

#### 3.3.2 Access and Circulation

The project includes improvements to the vehicular and pedestrian/accessibility circulation patterns (Figure 3-8). The main access road to the project site would be Campus Point Drive from Genesee Avenue. Access to the southern portion of the site from the southernmost entrance off Campus Point Drive would be improved to provide access to the proposed 6-level parking structure. Parking would be reconfigured in the southeastern portion of the site to allow for improved access. The central access point to the project site from Campus Pointe Drive would be reconfigured from a "T" type intersection to a curved roadway configuration that allows more direct flow to and from the project site without stop signs. This main entrance would lead to a promenade entry boulevard off Campus Point Drive. The road would be a circulation element that connects entries of new and existing buildings. Two roundabouts would be installed to provide access to parking areas to the north and south. Additionally, the promenade would serve as a major pedestrian linkage. Trees and understory planting would screen pedestrians from vehicular uses. Another major element of pedestrian circulation is the completion of a pedestrian loop trail. This informal trail would provide both functional linkages as well as exercise and recreation opportunities. Trees, landscaping, and gardens would be planted to provide shade and visual interest. Sidewalks would meet Americans with Disabilities Act requirements.

Roadways and fire lanes have been designed to meet the City Fire Marshal's Standards and would provide sufficient access for emergency vehicles. The main fire and emergency access road would be from Campus Point Drive.

#### 3.3.3 Landscaping Design

The design of the landscape improvements would build upon the existing amenity and planting character established by recent improvements that have occurred on-site in conjunction with the existing building. The connections to the surrounding native landscape, canyons, and valley are strengthened by a variety of pedestrian-scale use areas.

The design of the campus would incorporate a number of sustainable measures (Figure 3-9), including, but not limited to:

- Low water (site-appropriate plant palette)
- Storm water management (planted swales treat runoff)
- Low heat island effect (paving with a high Solar Reflectance Index value, trees, and structures for shading)
- Permeability of paving (reducing the amount of existing paved surfaces)
- Native and adapted vegetation (creating habitat value)

Several planting zones would be established based on relationship to canyons and intensity of the use area (Figures 3-10a through 3-10c). A large amount of existing open space and plantings would be preserved and maintained as habitat.



FIGURE 3-8 Accessibility Plan





GELIER

TREES







LAGERSTROEMIA INDICA 'PURPUREA'



LIQUIDAMBAR STYRACIFLUA 'FESTIVAL'





LOPHOSTEMON CONFERTUS

#### AMENITY AREA CHARACTER





GARDEN CORE - INTIMATE SPACE





GARDEN CORE - INTIMATE SPACE



#### HARDSCAPE



NHANCED CONCRETE - EXPOSED AGGREGATE FINIS



ENHANCED CONCRETE - TOPSEEDED AGGREGATE FINISH



STABILIZED DG PAVING



PRE-CAST CONCRETE PAVERS



STONE PAVING

FIGURE 3-9 Representative Examples of Project Trees, Amenity Areas, and Hardscape



	SCREENING PLANTI	NG SUCH AS:				
	ACACIA CULTIFORM		KNIF-LEAF WATTLE	BH/SC		
	CALLIANDRA CALIFO		RED FAIRY DUSTER	S,F/AC		
	GREVILLEA 'BONFI		NCN			
	HETEROMELES ARBI	JTIFOLIA	TOYON	S,E,F/SC		
	PITTOSPORUM TEN.	SLVER SHEEN	SILVER SHEEN TAWIWHI	BH/ SC, AC		
	SOCCER FIELD PLAN	TING SUCH AS:				
2222	SOD LAWN					
	-					
	NATURALIZED PLAN BACCHARIS PILULA		DWARF COYOTE BRUSH	BH/SC		
	ESCHSCHOLZIA CAL		CALIFORNIA POPPY	S/AC		
	MUHI ENBERGIA RIG		DEFR GRASS	U/AC		
	VIGUIERS LACINIAT		SAN DIEGO SUNELOWER	U, F/AC		
	YUCCA WHIPPLEI	•	OUR LORD'S CANDLE	U/AC		
	PARKING AREA PLAN		OUN LOND 3 CANDLE	07.40		
,	BULBINE FRUTESCE		YELLOW SNAKE FLOWER	U, S, F/A		
	HARDENBERGIA VIO		MEMEMA VINE LILAC	AC,SH,F		
	HELICTOTRICHON S		BLUE DAT GRASS	U/AC		
	SENECIO MANDRALI		KLENIA	S/AC		
	BIORETENTION PLA					
	CAREX SPISSA		SAN DIEGO SEDGE	S, E/AC		
	CHONDROPETALUM	TECTORUM	CAPE RUSH	U/AC		
	JUNCUS PATENS 'E	LK BLUE'	ELK BLUE CALIFORNIA GRAY RUSH	U,G / AC		
	LEYMUS CONDENSA	rus	WILD RYE	U.G / AC		
	BRUSH MANAGEMEN	T ZONE I SUCH AS (SEI	E NOTES)			
	CHONDROPETALUM	TECTORUM	CAPE RUSH	U/AC		
	ESCHSCHOLZIA CAL	IFORNICA	CALIFORNIA POPPY	S/AC		
	JUNCUS PATENS		CALIFORNIA GRAY RUSH	U/AC		
	SALVIA SPATHACEA		HUMMINGBIRD SAGE	U, F/AC		
	VIGUIERS LACINIAT		SAN DIEGO SUNFLOWER	U, F/AC		
	YUCCA WHIPPLEI		OUR LORD'S CANDLE	U/AC		
	BRUSH MANAGEMEN	T ZONE 2 SUCH AS (SEI	E NOTES)			
	ESCHSCHOLZIA CAL	IFORNICA	CALIFORNIA POPPY	S/AC		
	LUPINUS BICOLOR		PIGMY-LEAVED LUPINE	U, F/AC		
	MIMULUS PUNICEUS		RED MONKEY FLOWER	U.E.F /A		
	ERIOPHYLLUM CONF	ERTIFLORUM	GOLDEN YARROW	U, E, F /		
	PLANTAGO INSULAR	IS	PLANTAIN	S/AC		
	EXISTING ORNAMEN	TAL PLANTING WITHIN	THE PROPERTY BOUNDARY TO REMAIN	:		
	EXISTING SLOPE PL	EXISTING SLOPE PLANTING WITHIN THE PROPERTY BOUNDARY TO REMAIN:				
	EXISTING PLANT CO	IMMUNITIES REFER TO	D THE BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES REPORT			
252	DIEGAN COASTAL SA	AGE SCRUB				
	NON-NATIVE ANNUA	L GRASSLAND				
07	EUCALYPTUS WOOD	LAND				
	OTHER					
	PROPERTY LINE					
	BUILDING SETBACK					
000000000	EXISTING MHPA BOUNDA					
Cancing and an over	CORRECTED MHPA BOUN	point i				
	ADJUSTED MHPA BOUND	ARY				
	ABBREVIATIONS					
	FUNCTION:	D = DECIDUOUS	CU - CUIDE			
	BH = BROAD HEAD PY = PYRAMIDAL U = UPRIGHT	D = DECIDUOUS E = EVERGREEN P = PAI M	SH = SHADE SC = SCREEN AC = ACCFNT			



FIGURE 3-10a Landscaping Plan, Western Portion of Project Site



NTING SUCH AS : IFORNICA VFIRE IRBUTIFOLIA EN. 'SLVER SHEEN'	KNIF-LEAF WATTLE RED FAIRY DUSTER	BH/SC SJF/AC
IFORNICA NFIRE RBUTIFOLIA	RED FAIRY DUSTER	
NFIRE*		S,F/AC
RBUTIFOLIA		
EN. SLVER SHEEN	TOYON	S.E.F/SC
	SILVER SHEEN TAWIWHI	BH/ SC, AC
LANTING SUCH AS		
LANTING SUCH AS:		
ILARIS 'TWIN PEAKS'	DWARF COYOTE BRUSH	BH/SC
CALIFORNICA	CALIFORNIA POPPY	S/AC
RIGENS	DEER GRASS	U/AC
IATA	SAN DIEGO SUNFLOWER	U, F/AC
1	OUR LORD'S CANDLE	U/AC
LANTING SUCH AS1		
SCENS YELLOW	YELLOW SNAKE FLOWER	U. S. F/A
VIOLACEA 'MEEMA'	MEMEMA VINE LILAC	AC, SH, F
N SEMPERVIRENS	BLUE DAT GRASS	U/AC
ALISCAE	KLENIA	S/AC
PLANTING SUCH AS		
	SAN DIEGO SEDGE	S, E/AC
JM TECTORUM	CAPE RUSH	U/AC
ELK BLUE	ELK BLUE CALIFORNIA GRAY RUSH	U.G / AC
ISATUS	WILD RYE	U,G/AC
IENT ZONE I SUCH AS ISEE	NOTES)	
JH TECTORUM	CAPE RUSH	U/AC
CALIFORNICA	CALIFORNIA POPPY	S/AC
	CALIFORNIA GRAY RUSH	U/AC
CEA	HUMMINGBIRD SAGE	U, F/AC
IATA	SAN DIEGO SUNFLOWER	U, F/AC
1	OUR LORD'S CANDLE	U/AC
IENT ZONE 2 SUCH AS ISEE	NOTES)	
CALIFORNICA	CALIFORNIA POPPY	S/AC
DR	PIGHY-LEAVED LUPINE	U.F/AC
EUS	RED MONKEY FLOWER	U, E, F /
ONFERTIFLORUM	GOLDEN YARROW	U.E.F /
LARIS	PLANTAIN	S/AC
1ENTAL PLANTING WITHIN	THE PROPERTY BOUNDARY TO REMAIN:	
PLANTING WITHIN THE PP	OPERTY BOUNDARY TO REMAIN F	
COMMUNITIES REFER TO	THE BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES REPORT	
L SAGE SCRUB		
NUAL GRASSLAND		
DODLAND		

D = DECIDUOUS E = EVERGREEN P = PAIM

SH = SHADE SC = SCREEN AC = ACCFNT





FIGURE 3-10b Landscaping Plan, Central Portion of Project Site



ING PLANTING SUCH AS		
CULTIFORMIS	KNIF-LEAF WATTLE	BH/SC
NDRA CALIFORNICA	RED FAIRY DUSTER	S,F/AC
LEA 'BONFIRE'	NCN	
MELES ARBUTIFOLIA	TOYON	S,E,F/SC
PORUM TEN. 'SLVER SHEEN'	SILVER SHEEN TAWIWHI	BH/ SC, AC
FIELD PLANTING SUCH AS:		
WN		
LIZED PLANTING SUCH AS:		
RIS PILULARIS 'TWIN PEAKS'	DWARF COYOTE BRUSH	BH/SC
HOLZIA CALIFORNICA	CALIFORNIA POPPY	S/AC
BERGIA RIGENS	DEER GRASS	U/AC
RS LACINIATA	SAN DIEGO SUNFLOWER	U, F/AC
WHIPPLEI	OUR LORD'S CANDLE	U/AC
5 AREA PLANTING SUCH AS		
E FRUTESCENS 'YELLOW'	YELLOW SNAKE FLOWER	U, S, F/A
BERGIA VIOLACEA "MEEMA"	MEMEMA VINE LILAC	AC, SH, F
DTRICHON SEMPERVIRENS	BLUE DAT GRASS	U/AC
0 MANDRALISCAE	KLENIA	S/AC
ENTION PLANTING SUCH AS		
SPISSA	SAN DIEGO SEDGE	S, E/AC
OPETALUM TECTORUM	CAPE RUSH	UZAC
PATENS 'ELK BLUE'	ELK BLUE CALIFORNIA GRAY RUSH	U, G / AC
CONDENSATUS	WILD RYE	U,G/AC
MANAGEMENT ZONE I SUCH AS 15	EE NOTES)	
OPETALUM TECTORUM	CAPE RUSH	UZAC
HOLZIA CALIFORNICA	CALIFORNIA POPPY	S/AC
PATENS	CALIFORNIA GRAY RUSH	UZAC
SPATHACEA	HUMMINGBIRD SAGE	U, F/AC
RS LACINIATA	SAN DIEGO SUNFLOWER	U.F/AC
WHIPPLEI	OUR LORD'S CANDLE	U/AC
MANAGEMENT ZONE 2 SUCH AS 15	EE NOTES)	
HOLZIA CALIFORNICA	CALIFORNIA POPPY	S/AC
S BICOLOR	PIGMY -LEAVED LUPINE	U.F/AC
S PUNICEUS	RED MONKEY FLOWER	U, E, F /
YLLUH CONFERTIFLORUM	GOLDEN YARROW	U, E, F /
GO INSULARIS	PLANTAIN	S/AC
IG ORNAMENTAL PLANTING WITH	IN THE PROPERTY BOUNDARY TO REMAIN	
NG SLOPE PLANTING WITHIN THE	PROPERTY BOUNDARY TO REMAIN:	
IG PLANT COMMUNITIES REFER	TO THE BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES REPOR	τ
COASTAL SAGE SCRUB		
TIVE ANNUAL GRASSLAND		
PTUS WOODLAND		
LINE		
ETBACK		
HPA BOUNDARY		
MHPA BOUNDARY		

SH = SHADE SC = SCREEN AC = ACCFNT



#### FIGURE 3-10c Landscaping Plan, Eastern Portion of Project Site

#### 3.3.4 Brush Management

A comprehensive brush management program would be implemented to reduce fire hazards around structures by providing an effective fire break between all structures and contiguous areas of native or naturalized vegetation. Proposed building CP3 is the only habitable structure proposed adjacent to native vegetation. This structure would incorporate two distinct brush management zones (BMZ); BMZ-1 and BMZ-2.

- BMZ-1 is the area adjacent to the structure and shall be the least flammable, and typically consist of pavement and permanently irrigated ornamental planting. BMZ-1 is considered a permanent impact and, therefore, is included in the development footprint for the project. BMZ-1 is located west and south of proposed building CP3 and ranges from 35 feet to 90 feet wide.
- BMZ-2 is the area between BMZ-1 and any area of native or naturalized vegetation, and typically consists of thinned, native or naturalized non-irrigated vegetation. A triangular shaped BMZ-2 is proposed just southwest of proposed building CP3 and would be 65 feet wide at its widest point. BMZ-2 is considered impact neutral. Refer to Figure 3-7 for the location of BMZ-2.

Actual zone widths for the Campus Point project may vary over the site utilizing the zone reduction options set forth under Land Development Code (LDC) 142.0412(f) and alternative compliance measures set forth under LDC 142.0412(i) to avoid encroachments into Steep Hillsides and/or City-owned open space.

#### 3.3.5 Transportation Demand Management

Transportation Demand Management (TDM) is a strategy designed to reduce single occupant vehicle trips during the AM and PM peak weekday hours. Since most commuting and congestion occur during weekday peak periods, TDM seeks to shift commuters to transportation modes other than cars as well as reduce peak hour trips by encouraging commuting in non-peak periods and other strategies.

TDM measures that the project would incorporate include the following:

- Bulletin boards in central locations which encourage alternative transportation programs.
- Request tenants implement telecommute and staggered work hours to avoid peak hour traffic.
- A TDM association/coordinator for the tenants of Campus Point to facilitate publication and distribution of information as well as ensure it remains current.
- Informational quarterly newsletters to tenants discussing Ride-LinkiCommute and other tools for carpooling, bicycling, and alternative modes of transportation.
- Bike lockers on-site.
- Showers on-site.

- Carpooling priority parking.
- Carpool Association.
- A shuttle system upon project occupancy of 75 percent. The shuttle would connect the Campus Point property with the University Towne Center transit center and the Sorrento Valley Transit Center. The planned system would consist of one 10-passenger van with 30-minute headways during the AM and PM peak hours. It would be in operation between peak hours 7:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m. and 4:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. During off-peak hours of 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m., the shuttle would operate with 1-hour headways.
- An incentive program for carpool and off-peak travelers, which may consist of a credit voucher to eat at the on-site restaurant or other incentives.
- Request tenants of the new buildings offer transit passes for their employees at a 25 percent discount.
- A bike-share program offered to employees of tenants in the new buildings.

# 3.3.6 Phasing, Demolition, Project Grading, and Construction

The project is not proposing a formal phasing plan. However, from a constructability standpoint, the project would be implemented generally in two primary phases. The first phase focuses on construction of the 10,000-square-foot CP4 building, access improvements, and some landscaping/parking improvements. The second phase would construct the remainder of the project to include the new CP3 scientific research building, the 9-level 1,500-stall parking structure, and the remainder of the boulevard improvements north of building CP3.

Specific construction phasing and equipment parameters for the project are not available at this time, but would consist of standard construction equipment and typical construction schedules. The demolition of paved parking areas, landscaping, and an ancillary structure would also be required. At full buildout, the site would have a total floor area of 1,060,108 square feet. Parking spaces would peak at 2,909 with a parking ratio of 2.74 spaces per 1,000 square feet. As shown in Figure 3-11, the entire project would grade 12.88 acres of the existing site, with 60,200 cubic yards of cut and 7,600 cubic yards of fill. Overall, approximately 52,600 cubic yards of soil would be exported, with 47,100 cubic yards of export from the required excavation for the proposed parking structure. Thus, a majority of the soil export would occur during the second phase of the project. To reduce grading, two retaining walls, at a maximum of 330 feet long and 4 feet high, would be provided along the southern project boundary and along the edge of the central internal private access road. The maximum height of fill slopes would be 3 feet (at a 2:1 slope ratio) and there would be zero cut slopes. The project would not encroach into Environmentally Sensitive Lands (ESL) steep hillsides.



#### FIGURE 3-11 Conceptual Grading Plan
# 3.3.7 Infrastructure

### 3.3.7.1 Drainage

The proposed drainage improvements would consist of a system of catch basins, storm drain inlets, bioretention areas, and an underground storm drain system. The project site has been divided into five drainage management areas (Basins 1 through 5). Each of the drainage management areas would drain to a bioretention area or biofiltration device (modular wetland system) prior to discharge into the on-site storm water conveyance system. The modular wetland systems are a linear biofiltration device that provides both bioretention and filtration while providing a landscaping and design element of the project. Drainage management areas 1, 2, and 5 would also incorporate an underground storm water detention box to increase storm water holding capacity. Bioretention areas would allow runoff to pond and filter through the soil or filtration medium. Multiple bioretention areas would be constructed on-site. The new, private, underground storm drain would consist of polyvinyl chloride or high-density polyethylene pipe with watertight joints.

The project would generally maintain all existing drainage patterns. Runoff would ultimately be discharged from the project site at the same locations as in the existing condition. Discharge locations include the base of the canyon located to the west, to the southeast toward City's storm drain within Campus Point Drive, and to the south through a public storm drain that exits the site from a midpoint on the southern project boundary.

### 3.3.7.2 Water

The proposed public and private water mains would be located within private drives (within public utility easements) throughout the project site. The water main system would be developed to provide looped water mains, where possible, to reduce the number of dead-end mains.

### 3.3.7.3 Wastewater

The proposed sewer mains would be located within private, on-site drives throughout the project site. The existing private 8-inch sewer would connect to a new 8-inch sewer force main, which would connect to a new 8-inch sewer pipe serving the proposed buildings CP3 and CP4. These lines would discharge into the existing public 12-inch sewer main that flows to the east, down the slope to the truck sewer. On-site sewer mains would be private.

### 3.3.7.4 Utilities

San Diego Gas & Electric (SDG&E) currently provides electricity and natural gas to the project. Utilities necessary to serve the project would be installed in conjunction with development of the site. Improvements to electricity, natural gas, and communication systems infrastructure would take place within the project site.

# 3.3.8 Environmental Design Considerations

The project has been designed to comply with the general Climate Change and Sustainable Development goals contained in the General Plan's Conservation Element. The project would be constructed in accordance with the California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen).

LEED Silver certification under the LEED Building Design + Construction (LEED BD+C) rating system would require:

- Sustainable site (construction activity pollution prevention);
- Water efficiency (indoor and outdoor water use reduction, building-level water metering);
- Energy and atmosphere (minimum energy performance, building-level energy metering, fundamental refrigerant management, fundamental commissioning and verification);
- Material and resources (storage and collection of recyclables, construction and demolition waste management planning); and
- Indoor environmental quality (minimum indoor air quality performance, environmental tobacco smoke control)

In order to achieve LEED Silver certification, the project would need to earn 50 to 59 points by incorporating additional design features in the above categories, plus location and transportation (access to quality transit, surrounding density and diverse uses), integrative process credits (analysis of the interrelationships among systems), innovation (achieving exceptional or innovative performance), and/or regional priority (addressing geographically specific environmental, social equity, and public health priorities). Overall, the project would be conditioned to meet the following:

- Achieve LEED Silver certification;
- Achieve 2013 Title 24, Part 6 Energy Code and Part 11 CALGreen requirements;
- Exceed 2008 Title 24, Part 6 Energy Code by 45 percent; and
- Reduce water consumption by 25 percent relative to Title 24 Part 11 requirements.

# 3.4 Discretionary Actions

Discretionary actions are those actions taken by an agency that call for the exercise of judgment in deciding whether to approve or how to carry out a project. For the project, the following discretionary actions would be considered by the City Council and are further described below:

- Community Plan Amendment (required for modifications to the UCP)
- SDP (required for development in the Community Plan Implementation Overlay Zone [CPIOZ] Type A and B of the UCP; required for ESL because the project does not meet the exemption criteria in LDC, Section 143.0110)
- NDP (required for alternative calculation for the maximum intensity allowed within the Accident Potential Zone (APZ) 2 zone for Marine Corps Air Station [MCAS] Miramar).

# 3.4.1 Community Plan Amendment

The Development Intensity Element of the UCP establishes subareas with specified land use and development intensities (see Figure 2-5). According to UCP Table 3 (UCP page 164), the project site is allowed 30,000 sf/ac of scientific research use; however, proposed development would be required to mitigate its peak-hour trip generation rate to a level equal to or less than that which would be generated by a project of 18,000 square feet per acre (sf/ac). The UCP states that mitigation would be achieved through a Transportation System Management program, to be approved by the City Council. As discussed further in Section 4.1.3.1 Land Use, the project would comply with the 30,000 sf/ac requirement; however, while the project would include a TDM Program, it is not feasible for the City or applicant to control employees' transportation choices to guarantee that trips would be reduced to the equivalent of an 18,000 sf/ac development as required by the UCP. Therefore, the proposed Community Plan Amendment would amend the UCP Table 3, footnote 3 to modify the requirement to "Alexandria shall be required to mitigate its peak hour trip generation rate to a level equal to or less than which would be generated by a project of 20,000 sf/ac."

# 3.4.2 Site Development Permit

A SDP is required for development within the City's CPIOZ, Types A and B pursuant to the City's Biology Guidelines (see Figure 2-4). The CPIOZ provides supplemental development regulations that are tailored to specific sites within community plan areas of the City. The intent of these regulations is to ensure that development proposals are reviewed for consistency with the use and development criteria that have been adopted for specific sites as part of the community plan update process.

The SDP would also be required where any portion of the *premises* contains environmentally sensitive lands; which in the case of the proposed project includes both sensitive biological resources and steep hillsides. Sensitive biological resources are addressed pursuant to the LDC (see Section 4.3). Steep hillsides are addressed in Section 4.1.7 (Land Use – LDC Compliance). The SDP specifies that using the alternative calculation allowed with a NDP (pursuant to Municipal Development Code Section 132.1515(d), the site can accommodate a maximum of 1,163,600 square feet of scientific research and development space.

# 3.4.3 Neighborhood Development Permit

The project site is in the Airport Influence Area for MCAS Miramar, within a Safety Compatibility Zone designated as APZ-2 (see Figure 2-9). Per compatibility criteria, the type of use proposed (Research and Development) is a "limited" use, restricted to 0.34 floor area ratio. A NDP for an alternative method of calculation is being requested, as detailed in Municipal Code Section 132.1515(d). Pursuant to Municipal Code Section 132.1550(c)(4), a consistency determination from the San Diego County Regional Airport Authority is required prior to approval. Any conditions imposed by San Diego County Regional Airport Authority will be incorporated into the NDP.

# 3.4.4 Multi-Habitat Planning Area Boundary Line Correction

A Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA) boundary line correction (BLC) is a ministerial action which is intended to correct the MHPA boundary where legal grading and construction of surface parking occurred prior to the implementation of the City's Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP).

# 3.5 History of Project Changes

A Draft EIR was previously prepared for a smaller 41.67-acre project in which the buildings were proposed to be located along the northern property line, adjacent to the MHPA. The University City Community Planning Group had concerns about proximity to the MHPA as well as the aesthetics impacts due to the parking structure being located at the extreme northeastern corner of the mesa. At that location, the parking structure (as previously proposed) was very visible from the Interstate 5 corridor. As a direct response to the University City Community Planning Group comments, The applicant purchased the adjacent 16.52-acre property which contains the CP2 building which allowed for a redesign to address the planning group's comments. Combining the two sites enabled the design team to reconfigure the master plan such that all of the proposed new construction, including building CP3, building CP4, the parking structure, now occur along the southern portion of the site; adjacent to existing development on the mesa instead of along the mesa rim next to the MHPA. Combining the two sites also meant that the project area was exactly the same as what was analyzed in a 1993 EIR prepared for IVAC. As discussed in Section 1.3, this SEIR tiers to the certified 1993 FEIR (No. 91-0360); and in doing so, serves as a supplement to the 1993 FEIR and addresses issues which would require major revisions of the 1993 EIR. Further, subsequent to the preparation of the Draft EIR, additional TDM measures were added to the project. These additional measures included reducing parking toward the minimum allowed required by the City of San Diego Municipal Code, encouragement of tenants implementing telecommute and staggered work hours, a shuttle system to the University Town Center and Sorrento Valley transit centers, an incentive program for carpool and off-peak travelers, encouragement of tenants providing 25 percent discounted transit passes to their employees, and a bike-share program.



# Chapter 4 Environmental Analysis

Table 1-1 provides a summary of the issues analyzed in the 1993 Final Impact Report (FEIR). As shown, the issues of traffic, land use, noise, air quality, safety/hazardous materials, hydrology/water quality, and cumulative effects were previously analyzed. Through City review of the project, the following issues were determined to either: (1) lack adequate mitigation for project impacts; or (2) result in new impacts that may be potentially significant and require subsequent analysis and/or mitigation as part of this SEIR:

- Land Use
- Traffic
- Biological Resources
- Historical Resources
- Paleontological Resources
- Visual Quality/Neighborhood Character

This chapter analyzes the potentially new environmental impacts that may occur as a result of project implementation. Each section within this chapter includes an environmental issue that has been identified for this project and addresses the issues from the 1993 FEIR that require supplemental analysis.

The issue analyses include a summary of existing conditions; the criteria for the determination of impact significance; evaluation of potential project impacts; a list of required mitigation measures if applicable; conclusion of significance after mitigation for impacts identified as requiring mitigation; and a comparison to the conclusions in the 1993 FEIR.

All potential direct and indirect impacts are evaluated in relation to applicable City, state, and federal standards, as reflected in the City's 2011 Significance Determination Thresholds, and include City goals and standards in compliance with the City General Plan (2008).

There are several environmental subject areas contained within the 1993 FEIR which do not require supplemental analysis and are addressed only briefly in this SEIR. This is because the project would result in lesser impacts as compared to the 1993 FEIR; or would not result in changes affecting the analysis in the 1998 EIR, as there were no substantial changes in circumstances or new information available with respect to each subject area that would trigger a need for supplemental review (California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15162). Refer to Chapter 8 for a summary of the issues which were deemed to be adequately analyzed within the 1993 FEIR, to which this document is tiered.

# 4.1 Land Use

This section updates the land use analysis in the 1993 FEIR, with an emphasis on changes related to effects addressed in the previous report. At the time that the 1993 FEIR was prepared, the air quality, noise, and traffic were determined to interfere with the environmental goals of the University Community Plan (UCP) and to correspondingly cause significant and unmitigated land use impacts. New air quality and noise technical reports conclude that air quality and noise impacts are no longer significant and unmitigated. New land use plans and regulations have come into effect since the 1993 FEIR, including the General Plan, the Land Development Code (LDC), and the Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP), as well as the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) for Marine Corps Air Station (MCAS) Miramar. Thus, this section is an update analysis of consistency with these plans/regulations. The compatibility of the project with surrounding land uses is also discussed.

# 4.1.1 Existing Conditions

### 4.1.1.1 Existing On-site and Surrounding Land Uses

The project site consists of two parcels containing industrial/scientific research facilities, accessory uses, surface parking, landscaping, and open space. The existing development is located in the northern portion of the site and the southeastern portion of the site with surface parking, internal roadways, and smaller ancillary structures occupying the remainder of the site. Open space is located on the eastern, northern, and western perimeters (see Figure 2-3). Surrounding existing land uses are similar, and include open space to the north and east, 5 (I-5) to the west, and industrial to the south.

### 4.1.1.2 Existing Land Use Plans and Development Regulations

The planning context of the environmental setting, Section 2.5 of this EIR, provides an overview of the land use plans and development regulations that apply to development of the project. Land use plans that are applicable to the site include the City's General Plan, UCP, MSCP Plan and LDC, as well as the MCAS Miramar ALUCP. The following provides an expansion of the planning context's discussion of relevant plans and development regulations.

#### a. City of San Diego General Plan

The City's General Plan sets forth a comprehensive, long-term plan for development within the City. A comprehensive update of the City's General Plan was adopted on March 10, 2008, and was based on a planning strategy for the City developed in the 2002 Strategic Framework Element. Known as the City of Villages strategy, the General Plan aims to redirect development away from undeveloped

lands and toward already urbanized areas and/or areas with conditions allowing the integration of housing, employment, civic, and transit uses. This development strategy mirrors regional planning and smart growth principles intended to preserve remaining open space and natural habitat and focus development within areas with available public infrastructure.

The Strategic Framework comprises the introductory chapter of the General Plan, followed by 10 elements (descriptions of the elements that apply to the project are provided in the following paragraphs).

- Land Use and Community Planning
- Mobility
- Urban Design
- Economic Prosperity
- Public Facilities, Services, and Safety
- Historic Preservation
- Recreation
- Conservation
- Noise
- Housing

The **Land Use and Community Planning Element** (Land Use Element) provides policies to implement the City of Villages strategy within the context of the City's community planning program. The element addresses land use issues that apply to the City as a whole and identifies the community planning program as the mechanism to designate land uses, identify site-specific recommendations, and refine citywide policies as needed. The Land Use Element establishes a structure for the diversity of each community and includes policy direction to govern the preparation of community plans. The element addresses zoning and policy consistency, the plan amendment process, airport-land use planning, balanced communities, equitable development, and environmental justice.

The project site is identified in the General Plan's Land Use and Street System Map (contained in the Land Use and Community Planning Element) as both Industrial Employment and Park, Open Space and Recreation (Figure 4.1-1). The map is a composite of land uses specified in the adopted community plans.

The **Mobility Element** contains policies that promote a balanced, multi-modal transportation network while minimizing environmental and neighborhood impacts. In addition to addressing walking, streets, and transit, the element also includes policies related to regional collaboration, bicycling, parking, the movement of goods, and other components of the transportation system.

**Urban Design Element** policies call for development that respects the City's natural setting; enhances the distinctiveness of neighborhoods; strengthens the natural and built linkages; and creates mixed-use, walkable villages throughout the City. The Urban Design Element addresses urban form and design through policies relative to the City's natural environment that work to preserve open space systems and target new growth into compact villages.



FIGURE 4.1-1

General Plan Land Use and Street System Map

Industrial Employment

The **Economic Prosperity Element** provides a policy framework to promote economic prosperity by growing the economy through the retention and creation of jobs with self-sufficient wages, the stimulation of investment, the strengthening of industry, and by increasing average income. One of the primary goals of this element is to maintain and efficiently use employment lands. The project site is identified as prime industrial land in the element, which are lands of particular importance to the regional economy. Protection of base sector employment areas are emphasized in this element, and encroachment of other uses are discouraged.

The **Public Facilities**, **Services**, **and Safety Element** is directed at providing adequate public facilities through policies that address public financing strategies, public and developer financing responsibilities, prioritization, and the provision of specific facilities and services that must accompany growth. The policies within the Public Facilities Element also apply to transportation and park and recreation facilities and services.

The **Conservation Element** contains policies to guide the conservation of resources that are fundamental components of the City's environment, help define the City's identity, and are relied upon for continued economic prosperity. The City's resources include, but are not limited to, water, land, air, biodiversity, minerals, natural materials, recyclables, topography, viewsheds, and energy.

The **Historic Preservation Element** guides the preservation, protection, restoration, and rehabilitation of historical and cultural resources.

The **Noise Element** provides goals and policies to guide compatible land uses and the incorporation of noise attenuation measures for new uses to protect people living and working in the City from an excessive noise environment.

#### b. University Community Plan

The UCP outlines specific goals and policies for the University community, and designates the site for Industrial and Open Space. The UCP was adopted on July 7, 1987, and has subsequently been amended in 1998 and 1990 to implement urban design guidelines; in 2006 to address public safety; and in 2011 to address the ALUCP for MCAS Miramar. Various other amendments have also been made for private development projects, but those changes do not apply to the project site.

The UCP provides detailed land use and policy guidance for development within the University Community, as well as the following goals:

- 1. Ensure that industrial land needs, as required for a balanced economy and balanced land use, are met consistent with environmental considerations.
- 2. Protect a reserve of manufacturing land from encroachment by non-manufacturing uses.
- 3. Develop and maintain procedures to allow employment growth in the manufacturing sector.
- 4. Encourage the development of industrial land uses that are compatible with adjacent nonindustrial uses and match the skills of the local labor force.

- 5. Emphasize the citywide importance of and encourage the location of scientific research uses in the North University area because of its proximity to the University of California, San Diego.
- 6. Improve the central community's urban form and cohesiveness as new construction activity commences.

To implement these goals, the UCP includes objectives and proposals to ensure quality site design consistent with the General Plan and appropriate to the community. The UCP contains the following 12 elements; those elements relevant to the project are briefly described below.

- Urban Design
- Transportation
- Development Intensity
- Housing/Residential
- Commercial
- Industrial

- Open Space and Recreation
- Noise
- Safety
- Public Facilities
- Resource Management
- General Plan Consistency

The **Urban Design Element** contains urban design standards intended to improve accessibility by providing linkages, providing for the needs of pedestrians by improving the public realm, and addressing the unique topography, climate, and vegetation in the design of new development. The community is divided into subareas with specific design criteria. The project is located within the Central Subarea, which is described as an urban subarea characterized by intense multiple use development.

The **Transportation Element** aims to provide a transportation network that is integrated and complementary to the transportation network of the City and the region. The UCP identifies a balanced public transportation system as a link between community areas and a link to the greater City metro area. This element emphasizes the need to coordinate private development proposals with existing and planned transit and utilize transportation system management plans to reduce peak hours trips. Specific proposals in the element are directed at street network improvements, the incorporation of transit improvements in projects, and the improvement of linkages and facilities for non-motorized transportation.

The **Development Intensity Element** contains guidelines for the intensity of development in the community, which is limited by the constraints of the transportation system. The overall goal is an equitable allocation of development intensities in conjunction with a workable transportation system. The Development Intensity Element is implemented through Community Plan Implementation Overlay Zone (CPIOZ B), which applies to the project site.

The UCP establishes development intensity limits by subarea. Development intensity is specified in Table 3 of the Development Intensity Element of the UCP. The project site is identified as Subarea 10 Campus Point, as the IVAC site, and is allocated a development intensity of 30,000 square feet per acre (sf/ac). Per footnote 3 in the table, this Campus Point Subarea is required to mitigate the peak-hour trip generation rate to a level equal to or less than that which would be generated by a project

of 18,000 sf/ac. Per the UCP, the net site acreage is defined as the total site area minus any area designated as open space or Environmentally Sensitive Lands (ESL). The existing 731,725 square feet of building space on the 40.28-net-acre site is within the allowable net intensity of 1,208,400 square feet.

The **Industrial Element** contains policies to ensure that industrial lands are maintained for industrial uses by limiting the encroachment of other uses, and that future development preserves and encourages the growth of the manufacturing and research and development sectors. The importance of maintaining industrial lands for employment and the prosperity of the region is emphasized. The element identifies the area in North University as an area of citywide importance for the location of scientific research uses due to the proximity of UCSD.

The **Open Space/Recreation Element** aims to preserve the natural resources of the community, including topographic features and biological resources, through an interconnected open space system that connects natural open space and recreational areas in the community. This element also provides for a system of population-based recreational parks. Hillside development guidelines address grading, visual impacts, coastal development, vegetation, and safety.

The **Noise Element** contains objectives directed at minimizing and avoiding noise impacts by appropriately siting land uses. The element provides guidelines for the mitigation of noise impacts in areas where incompatible land uses are located near noise sources. Major sources of noise are aircraft from MCAS Miramar, vehicles on roadways, and railroad trains.

The **Safety Element** addresses safety related to the geologic hazards and the accident potential due to MCAS Miramar. The goals of this element are to guide development so that it is compatible with geologic risks and does not increase geologic hazards, and to address land use and airport computability during the development process.

The **Resource Management Element** provides policy guidance on the preservation of the natural resources in the community as well as the conservation of energy and water.

#### c. Land Development Code Regulations

Chapters 11 through 14 of the City's Municipal Code are referred to as the LDC, as they contain the City's planning, zoning, subdivision, and building regulations that dictate how land is to be developed within the City. The LDC contains citywide base zones that specify permitted land use, density, floor area ratio (FAR), and other development requirements for given zoning classifications, as well as overlay zones and supplemental regulations that provide additional development requirements.

Chapter 13, Zones, includes use and development regulations pertinent to the base zone classifications. The underlying base zone for the majority of the project site is Industrial Park (IP)-1-1, which allows for research and development uses as well as some limited manufacturing (see Figure 2-7). The IP zones are intended for high-quality science and business park development in a campus environment. A portion of the project site on the east side of Campus Point Drive and on the southwest portion of the site has underlying base zones of RS-1-7 and RS-1-14. These residential zones allow for the development of single-dwelling units on lot sizes of 5,000 square feet. These residential zones were utilized by the City as holding zones to preclude premature development.

Chapter 14 of the LDC includes the general development regulations, supplemental development regulations, subdivision regulations, building regulations, and electrical/plumbing/mechanical regulations that govern all aspects of project development. The grading, landscaping, parking, signage, fencing, and storage requirements are all contained within the Chapter 14 general regulations. Also included within the general regulations of Chapter 14 are the ESL Regulations, discussed below. The site is also subject to the Airport Land Use Compatibility Overlay Zone (ALUCOZ) for MCAS Miramar; the Campus Parking Impact Overlay Zone; and CPIOZ Areas "A" and "B" of the UCP, which are also discussed below. All other applicable land development regulations are discussed throughout this EIR, particularly in Chapters 3 (Project Description) and 4 (Environmental Analysis).

#### **Environmentally Sensitive Lands Regulations**

The purpose of the ESL regulations is to protect and preserve ESLs (i.e., steep hillsides, coastal beaches and bluffs, sensitive biological resources, and special flood hazard areas) and the viability of the species supported by those lands. The regulations are intended to assure that development occurs in a manner that protects the overall quality of the resources and the natural and topographic character of the area (Municipal Code, Chapter 14, Article 3: Supplemental Regulations, Division 1: Environmentally Sensitive Lands Regulations, Section 143.0101 et seq.). The project site is subject to the ESL Ordinance because it contains sensitive biological resources and steep hillsides.

#### Airport Land Use Compatibility Overlay Zone

The Airport Land Use Compatibility Overlay Zone (ALUCOZ) within Chapter 13, Article 2 of the San Diego Municipal Code is intended to implement adopted ALUCPs and applies to areas that are within Airport Influence Areas of adopted ALUCPs. The site is located within Accident Potential Zone II (APZ II). In accordance with Table 132-15F of the ALUCOZ regulations, the research and development use is a "limited use" within APZ II and is conditionally compatible if development is limited to a FAR of 0.34. The intent of this regulation is to limit the density of people in the APZ II to 50 people per acre in accordance with the MCAS Miramar ALUCP, and the Municipal Code acknowledges that the FAR may not accurately predict the density of people for certain land uses. To accommodate this, the Municipal Code allows for alternative methods to demonstrate compliance with the maximum intensity (people per acre) through a Neighborhood Development Permit. The Neighborhood Development Permit would be required to include conditions of approval that set building occupancy limits and maximum parking spaces that are intended to limit the number of people on-site to 50 people per acre.

#### Community Plan Implementation Overlay Zone

The CPIOZ Type "B" Permit is applied where zoning is consistent with the land use designation in the plan, but where special design considerations apply. Without the application of CPIOZ B, development in these areas would be subject to ministerial review only, and therefore would not be reviewed for consistency with the goals and proposals of the UCP. The application of CPIOZ B is intended to ensure review of development projects for consistency with the UCP, compatibility with the MCAS Miramar ALUCP, and for implementation of project design features compatible with surrounding development. The discretionary review of these sites would ensure that development is consistent with the design guidelines contained in the Urban Design Element of the Plan, that

adequate pedestrian circulation is provided, and that the architecture, grading, lot coverage, height, bulk, and orientation of buildings, etc., is compatible with surrounding development.

Specific urban design considerations are identified in the UCP for implementation under the CPIOZ B and include the architectural design of buildings, structures, and signs; construction materials; grading and site development; height and bulk of buildings; land use, including intensity of land use and accessory use; lot coverage; orientation of buildings; yards; pedestrian circulation within the site and connections to adjacent projects; parking; safety zones for MCAS Miramar; and noise.

A portion of the site on the east side of Campus Point Drive is within CPIOZ A. The purpose of CPIOZ A is to limit uses and development intensity to the levels specified in the UCP. In the case of this project, the CPIOZ A overlay only applies to the portions of the site that are outside the development footprint (refer to Figure 2-6).

#### d. Multiple Species Conservation Program Subarea Plan

The MSCP is a comprehensive, long-term habitat conservation planning program that covers approximately 900 square miles in southwestern San Diego County under the federal and state Endangered Species Acts and state Natural Community Conservation Planning (NCCP) Act of 1991. Local jurisdictions, including the City, implement their portions of the regional umbrella MSCP through subarea plans, which describe specific implementing mechanisms. The City's MSCP Subarea Plan was approved in March 1997 and covers approximately 206,000 acres within the City's jurisdictional boundary. The City, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) have signed an MSCP Implementing Agreement that allows the City to issue incidental take authorizations for "MSCP Covered" species. The MSCP identifies approximately 57,000 acres as Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA) that is assumed to be 90 percent conserved in order to adequately preserve habitat for the MSCP covered species.

The MSCP designates a portion of the site as MHPA (see Figure 2-8). This on-site MHPA area consists of Diegan coastal sage scrub, non-native grassland, eucalyptus woodland, and urban/developed. In accordance with the MSCP, a boundary line correction (BLC) may be considered for the developed portion of the site.

#### **Boundary Line Correction**

A BLC is appropriate when the adopted MHPA boundary included existing developed areas in the MHPA. To obtain a BLC, it must clearly demonstrate that (1) the proposed area to be corrected was legally permitted, or (2) no habitat, including wetlands, would be removed, (3) no buffer area (e.g., wetland buffer, wildlife corridor) would be impacted, and (4) removing the area from the MHPA would not avert the applicant from having to otherwise comply with the City's MHPA Land Use Adjacency Guidelines.

The project site was developed in accordance with the 1979 and 1982 site plans (Permit A10329), prior to the adoption of the MSCP and associated MHPA mapping. As indicated above, a portion of the developed area of the site was mapped as MHPA. A BLC to correct 1.06 acres of urban/developed land occurring within Campus Point Drive from the MHPA was processed and

approved by the City MSCP staff and Wildlife Agencies on November 17, 2014 (Figure 4.1-2). A boundary line adjustment (BLA) was also processed concurrently; however, changes in the project design no longer necessitate the need for a BLA. An additional 0.03 acre of urban/developed land occurring in the off-site improvement area within Campus Point Drive is proposed to be corrected from the MHPA by the project (see Figure 4.1-2). The BLC is discussed in further detail in Section 4.1.4.1.

#### MHPA Land Use Adjacency Guidelines

The City's MSCP Subarea Plan provides Land Use Adjacency Guidelines to avoid or reduce significant indirect impacts to MHPAs from adjacent land uses. The Land Use Adjacency Guidelines include drainage, lighting, noise, barriers, and slope grading recommendations for adjacent development, as well as recommendations for avoiding or redirecting toxic chemicals (e.g., from landscape or agricultural fertilization) and prohibition of the planting of invasive species. Due to the site's location in relation to the MHPA, the project would be required to comply with the Land Use Adjacency Guidelines as discussed in Section 4.1.4.

#### e. ALUCP for MCAS Miramar

The current ALUCP for MCAS Miramar, adopted October 2008, provides for the orderly growth of the airport and the area surrounding the airport, and safeguards the general welfare of the inhabitants within the vicinity of the airport and the public in general. The ALUCP addresses compatibility between airport operations and future land uses that surround them by providing policies and criteria for aircraft overflight, noise, safety, and airspace protection, to both minimize the public's exposure to excessive noise and safety hazards within the airport influence area (AIA) and to preserve the viability of airport operations. The ALUCP defines the AIA as the area in which current or future airport-related noise, overflight, safety, or airspace protection factors may significantly affect land uses or necessitate restrictions on those uses.

The MCAS Miramar runways are approximately four miles southeast of the project site, and the project site is within the AIA for MCAS Miramar, the area in which current or future airport-related factors may affect land uses or necessitate restrictions on those uses. The project site lies within a safety zone, APZ II. Safety zones are established for the purpose of evaluating the safety compatibility of land use and development in the AIA. Development in APZ II is subject to land use compatibility and intensity restrictions. Any proposed land use plan amendments or rezones within AIA are required by state law to be submitted to the Airport Land Use Commission for a determination of consistency with the ALUCP. The ALUCP specifies limitations on the types of uses allowed in this area due to the safety concerns.

Prior to 2003, the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) served as the San Diego County Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC). Originally adopted in 1977, the 1990 MCAS Miramar Compatibility Land Use Plan (CLUP) identified the site to be located entirely in APZ II. The 1990 SANDAG CLUP restricted APZ II areas to be limited to 40 percent maximum coverage per lot (does not include surface parking and non-structural outdoor uses). According to the 1993 Eli Lilly/IVAC EIR, the project was compatible with the 40 percent building coverage lot restriction and mitigation measures were not required as it was deemed to be consistent with the NAS Miramar CLUP.















Boundary Line Correction (Approved November 17, 2014)



Off-site Boundary Line Correction

**Vegetation Communities** 

Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub

**Eucalyptus Woodland** 

Non-Native Grassland

Urban\Developed

**FIGURE 4.1-2** MHPA Boundary Line Correction

M:\JOBS3\5230\common\_gis\fig4.1-2.mxd 6/30/2016 ccn

The current ALUCP, however, identifies the usage intensity as the primary indicator for risk exposure to people from an aircraft accident (as opposed to the previous lot coverage restriction). This usage intensity is measured in persons per acre. Non-residential uses in the APZ II are limited to 50 persons per acre to minimize safety risk. Per compatibility criteria of APZ II, the existing Research and Development use on-site is a conditionally compatible use given that the FAR is restricted to 0.34 and usage intensity is limited to 50 persons per acre. Projects may exceed the FAR limitations if the usage intensity is maintained below the maximum, a deed restriction is placed on the property for the intensity limit, and the project meets the parking requirement on the local agency.

The project site is also within the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Part 77 Noticing Area for MCAS Miramar. The project site lies approximately 1,000 feet outside of the 60 community noise equivalent level (CNEL) contour line for MCAS Miramar.

# 4.1.2 Significance Determination Thresholds

Based on the City's 2011 Significance Determination Thresholds, impacts related to land use would be significant if the project would:

- 1. Result in an inconsistency with the environmental goals, objectives, or guidelines of a General/Community Plan;
- 2. Result in an inconsistency/conflict with an adopted land use designation or intensity and indirect or secondary environmental impacts occur;
- 3. Result in a substantial incompatibility with an adopted plan;
- 4. Result in an inconsistency/conflict with adopted environmental plans for an area;
- 5. Conflict with the provisions of the City's MSCP Subarea Plan and the MHPA or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan;
- 6. Result in the exposure of people to noise levels which are incompatible with the Noise Compatibility Guidelines (Table NE-3) in the Noise Element of the General Plan;
- 7. Result in incompatible uses as defined in an adopted ALUCP;
- 8. Result in land uses which are not compatible with aircraft noise levels as defined by an adopted ALUCP; or
- 9. Require a deviation or variance, and the deviation or variance would in turn result in a physical impact on the environment.

As stated in the City's Significance Thresholds, project inconsistency or conflict with a plan does not in and of itself constitute a significant environmental impact. The plan or policy inconsistency would have to result in a physical effect on the environment to be considered significant pursuant to the City's Significance Thresholds and California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

# 4.1.3 Issues 1, 2, and 3: Plan Consistency

Would the project result in an inconsistency with the environmental goals, objectives, or guidelines of a General/Community Plan?

Would the project result in an inconsistency/conflict with an adopted land use designation or intensity and indirect or secondary environmental impacts occur?

Would the project result in a substantial incompatibility with an adopted plan?

### 4.1.3.1 Impacts

#### a. Land Use Designation and Intensity

The project site is designated Industrial Employment and Open Space in the General Plan, and as Scientific Research and Open Space by the UCP. The proposed scientific research and development use on the site would be consistent with these land use designations of Industrial Employment and Scientific Research. Development of the site would occur in areas previously developed with surface parking. The areas of the site designated as Open Space and containing ESLs would be preserved consistent with the General Plan and UCP policies on open space.

The UCP specifies that the project site is allowed a development intensity of 30,000 sf/ac but it must mitigate peak-hour traffic to a level less than or equal to 18,000 sf/ac through a Transportation System Management (TSM) program. The UCP states that "[d]evelopment intensity and traffic generation will not be the sole factor upon which consistency will be judged" and that this requirement is intended to "ensure a workable circulation system."

The project would increase the development intensity to a total of 1,060,108 square feet (731,725 existing plus 328,383 proposed) on a net acreage of 40.28 acres, which is an intensity of 26,318.5 sf/net acre and within the allowable 30,000 sf/ac allowable development intensity. The project would include a Transportation Demand Management Program (TDM; equivalent to a TSM). As detailed in Section 3.3.5, the TDM would encourage employees to utilize carpools, alternative transportation, and other strategies to reduce vehicle trips. While the project would include a TDM Program, it is not feasible for the City or applicant to control employees' transportation choices to guarantee that peak hour trips would be reduced to the equivalent of an 18,000 sf/ac development as required by the UCP. Thus, the project would not be consistent with the UCP's requirement to mitigate trip generation to a level equivalent to an 18,000 sf/ac project. Therefore, the project proposes a Community Plan Amendment (CPA). Specifically, Attachment B - Table 3 of the Community Plan would be amended to modify the requirement to "Alexandria shall be required to mitigate its peak hour trip generation rate to a level equal to or less than which would be generated by a project of 20,000 sf/ac."

While the project would result in significant traffic impacts (Impacts TR-1 through TR-5), the project would mitigate all these impacts to below a level of significance with the exception of three temporary impacts; two at the I-5/Genesee Avenue interchange and one at the La Jolla Village Drive/Genesee Avenue intersection. The street segment at Genesee Avenue between I-5 SB ramps

and I-5 NB ramps and the I-5 SB ramps/Genesee Avenue intersection operates at an unacceptable LOS without the project; with the project, the LOS is further reduced and creates a significant impact. In addition, the improvement of the interchange is under the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) jurisdiction, and is currently under construction to be completed in the fall of 2017. The impacts at the I-5/Genesee Avenue Interchange are temporarily significant and unmitigated (until fall 2017). Traffic impacts at the I-5/Genesee interchange are disclosed (and discussed in greater detail) within Section 4.2, the project would not result in any significant secondary land use impacts. The direct and cumulative impacts at the La Jolla Village Drive/Genesee Avenue intersection will be temporarily significant and unmitigated until the completion of improvements that are fully funded and expected to begin construction in early 2017 by the University Towne Center Revitalization Project. Therefore, the project would not conflict with the transportation-related goals of the UCP Development Intensity Element.

Other plan and policy consistency and LDC limitations on development intensity related to the location of the site within the MCAS Miramar AIA APZ II and adjacent to MHPA/ESL are discussed in subsections 4.1.4 through 4.1.7.

#### b. Goals and Policies

The General Plan provides goals and policies that guide the development of community plans, as well as growth and development citywide. Most of the General Plan's goals are implemented through policy established in the UCP; however, there are also some General Plan policies that relate directly to the project. General Plan Elements and issues that relate specifically to the project include Land Use; Mobility; Urban Design; Economic Prosperity Public Facilities, Services, and Safety; Historic Preservation; Recreation; and Noise. UCP Elements and issues that relate specifically to the project include Urban Design, Transportation, Development Intensity, Industrial, Public Facilities, Open Space and Recreation, Noise, Safety, and Resource Management.

Table 4.1-1 (located at the end of this section) identifies relevant goals and policies of the General Plan and UCP and provides an analysis of the project's consistency. As demonstrated in Table 4.1-1, the project would be consistent with the applicable General Plan and UCP goals, objectives, and policies.

The UCP design guidelines are addressed in Table 4.1-1 as well. In summary, the project meets the UCP Central Subarea design guidelines based on the following factors:

- The proposed structures would be located along the periphery of the site within existing surface parking lot areas, and would provide appropriate visual transition and variety (see Figure 3-1).
- Solar access and view corridors would be maximized, and outdoor plazas would be provided.
- An internal pedestrian system would promote walking between buildings, and would also connect to the external sidewalk pedestrian system (see Figure 3-6).
- As with the current condition, the proposed open space areas would be adjacent to off-site open space areas.

- Considering the project location at the terminus of a roadway that only has development on one side and that the access location would remain the same, the project would not affect adjacent properties' access.
- The project would include parapets and screening of mechanical equipment and trash storage areas.
- Freeway noise would not be an issue for on-site uses, as discussed in Section 4.2.
- The proposed structures are designed to break up bulk and scale by articulating building mass with changes in plane, stepped terraces, and irregular architectural edges and to provide for a harmonious transition of the scale and height of adjacent buildings.

### 4.1.3.2 Significance of Impacts

The project would be consistent with the land use designations and the City's General Plan and UCP goals, policies, and objectives except one. The project would not be consistent with the UCP's requirement to mitigate traffic generation through a TSM, and that inconsistency would be eliminated through the proposed amendment to the UCP to remove the requirement to mitigate the peak-hour traffic generation through a TSM program. Thus, while the inconsistency related to traffic would remain until the Caltrans project at the I-5/Genesee Avenue interchange is complete in fall 2017, the improvement of the interchange is under Caltrans jurisdiction and out of the control of the City and applicant. Therefore, the traffic impacts at the I-5/Genesee Avenue interchange which are disclosed (and discussed in greater detail) within Section 4.2, would not result in any significant secondary land use impacts.

### 4.1.3.3 Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting

Impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

# 4.1.4 Issues 4 and 5: MSCP/MHPA Consistency

Would the project result in an inconsistency/conflict with adopted environmental plans for an area?

Would the project conflict with the provisions of the City's MSCP Subarea Plan and the MHPA or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

### 4.1.4.1 Impacts

A total of 10.08 acres of MHPA occurs within the project site (see Figure 2-8). The project would include a BLC to remove the previously developed portions of the project site that were mapped as part of the MHPA at the regional scale. No MHPA is located within the proposed impact area after the BLC discussed below is applied. Therefore, the project would not be in conflict with an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan, including the MSCP. Supporting information regarding the BLC is provided below.

#### a. Boundary Line Correction

The BLC would remove the previously developed portions of the project area that were mapped as part of the MHPA at the regional scale. The project site was developed in accordance with the 1979 and 1982 site plans (Permit A10329), prior to the adoption of the MSCP and associated MHPA mapping. As indicated above, a BLC to correct 1.06 acres of urban/developed land occurring within Campus Point Drive from the MHPA was processed and approved by the City MSCP staff and Wildlife Agencies on November 17, 2014 (see Figure 4.1-2). Following the approval of the initial BLA/BLC in November 2014, the project area was expanded to include the parcel directly south of the original project boundary and an improvement area off-site within the City's right-of-way. The off-site improvement area consists of urban/developed land associated with Campus Point Drive, and was included in the MHPA due to a minor mapping error. The project was subsequently redesigned to avoid impacts to sensitive vegetation communities within the MHPA, eliminating the need for the BLA. However, the redesigned project would require an additional off-site BLC to correct an additional 0.03 acre of urban/developed land occurring in the off-site improvement area from the MHPA to rectify the minor mapping error and allow for roadway improvements (see Figure 4.1-2).

Following the off-site BLC, a total of 8.99 acres would occur inside the MHPA and 49.42 acres outside the MHPA within the project area (see Figure 4.1-2). An addition to the MHPA would also be processed concurrently with BLC to convey the additional areas agreed upon from the original BLA, resulting in the addition of 1.63 acres of Diegan coastal sage scrub and 0.23 acre of eucalyptus woodland to the MHPA. Following the addition, a total of 10.85 acres would occur inside the MHPA within the project site. A detailed analysis of the BLC is presented in Table 4.1-2, below.

Table 4.1-2 Comparison of Existing and Corrected MHPA Boundary									
		Total	Previously Approved MHPA Boundary Line	Off-site Improvement		Total			
Habitat/Land Cover Types (City of San	MSCP	Inside MHPA Before BLC	Correction - November 2014	Area MHPA	MHPA Boundary Line Addition	Inside MHPA After BLC			
Diego 2012)	Tier	(acres)	(acres)	(acres)	(acres)	(acres)			
Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub	П	6.95	0.00	0.00	+1.63	8.58			
Non-Native Grassland	III-B	0.61	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.61			
Eucalyptus Woodland	IV	1.41	0.00	0.00	+0.23	1.64			
Urban/Developed	-	1.11	-1.06	-0.03	0.00	0.02			
TOTAL		10.08	-1.06	-0.03	+1.86	10.85			

The following findings support the Off-site Improvement Area BLC: (1) no habitat or wetlands are being removed from the MHPA for the area being corrected; (2) the proposed correction would not affect any buffers as there are no wetlands on the site and the site is not part of a regional wildlife

corridor; and (3) the proposed correction would not prevent the applicant from complying with the MHPA Land Use Adjacency Guidelines as the project remains adjacent to the MHPA and will comply with these guidelines.

#### b. MHPA Land Use Adjacency

The project has a potential for indirect impacts to the MHPA along the northern and eastern boundaries. As stated in the City of San Diego MSCP Subarea Plan Section 1.4.3 Land Use Adjacency Guidelines (MHPA Land Use Adjacency Guidelines; 1997), land uses adjacent to the MHPA are to be managed to ensure minimal impacts to the MHPA. The MSCP establishes land use adjacency guidelines to be addressed on a project-by-project basis when land is developed adjacent to the MHPA to minimize impacts resulting from construction or operational activities that may degrade the habitat value or disrupt animals within the preserve area and maintain the function of the MHPA.

A detailed description of the project's consistency with the MHPA Land Use Adjacency Guidelines is provided below. To ensure potential indirect impacts would be reduced to less than significant, the land use adjacency guidelines would be required as mitigation measures. Consistency measures that demonstrate the projects compliance with the MHPA Adjacency Guidelines are included below. Note that the discussion below first reiterates the MHPA Land Use Adjacency Guideline or Municipal Code (*italicized* text) and then analyzes the project's compliance with the guideline.

**Drainage.** Per the City of San Diego's Land Use Adjacency Guidelines, all new and proposed parking lots and developed areas in and adjacent to the MHPA shall be designed so they do not drain directly into the MHPA. All developed and paved areas must prevent the release of toxins, chemicals, petroleum products, exotic plant materials prior to release by incorporating the use of filtration devices, planted swales and/or planted detention/desiltation basins, or other approved permanent methods that are designed to minimize negative impacts, such as excessive water and toxins into the ecosystems of the MHPA (City of San Diego 1997).

The project would include private storm drain facilities consisting of a system of catch basins and pipelines, and each of the drainage management areas would drain to a bio-filtration area with an impermeable liner or a proprietary bio-filtration unit where it would be allowed to filter through planting medium and then through a perforated pipe into the storm drain system. In addition, underground storage will be used in conjunction with the bio-filtration to attenuate flows.

As discussed in greater detail within Section 8.3, Hydrology, the development of the project would not result in an increase in runoff. Because the proposed drainage patterns would be consistent with the existing conditions, the project would have no adverse impacts on the downstream facilities. Additionally, because the project would not result in a change in peak flows or drainage patterns, there would be no impact to existing significant biological resources, including MHPA, wetlands, or other significant environmental resources. The project would include water quality measures identified in applicable water quality control programs. The project has been designed to limit post-development storm water runoff discharge rates and velocities to maintain or reduce predevelopment erosion and to reduce nutrients, organic compounds, oxygen-demanding substances, oil and grease, bacteria and viruses, and pesticides by applying best management practices (BMPs). All drainage facilities that filter and dissipate velocity shall not be located within sensitive MHPA areas. Current Waste Discharge Requirements for Discharges from the Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems (MS4) permit requirements would also help to ensure compliance with the drainage requirements of the LUAG.

**Toxics/Project Staging Areas/Equipment Storage.** *Per the City of San Diego's Land Use Adjacency Guidelines, projects that use chemicals or generate by-products such as pesticides, herbicides, and animal waste, and other substances that are potentially toxic or impactive to native habitats/flora/fauna (including water) shall incorporate measures to reduce impacts caused by the application and/or drainage of such materials into the MHPA. No trash, oil, parking, or other construction/development-related material/activities shall be allowed outside any approved construction limits. Where applicable, this requirement shall be incorporated into leases on publicly owned property when applications for renewal occur. A note shall be provided on the CDs that states: "All construction related activity that may have potential for leakage or intrusion shall be monitored by the Qualified Biologist/Owners Representative or Resident Engineer to ensure there is no impact to the MHPA" (City of San Diego 1997).* 

The project would incorporate BMPs and project design features to reduce pollutant discharge offsite. The project would incorporate measures to reduce impacts caused by the application and/or drainage of chemicals or project generated by-products such as pesticides, herbicides, animal waste, and other substances that are potentially toxic or impactive to native habitats/flora/fauna (including water) into the MHPA. All construction-related activity that may have potential for leakage or intrusion shall be monitored by the Qualified Biologist to ensure there is no impact to the MHPA. As discussed above (see Drainage), the project has been designed to limit post-development storm water runoff discharge rates and velocities to maintain or reduce pre-development erosion and to reduce nutrients, organic compounds, oxygen demanding substances, oil and grease, bacteria and viruses, and pesticides by applying BMPs. The project would comply with all applicable federal, state, and local water quality standards through adherence to the City's Storm Water Standards and the SWRCB General Construction Permit Order 2012-0006.

A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) would be required to be prepared prior to construction in conformance with SWRCB Construction General Permit. The SWPPP would include BMPs to control site runoff volumes and reduce the potential for contaminated runoff. Construction BMPs, such as monitoring, flagging, staking or silt/bio fencing around sensitive areas would be used to ensure toxins from construction and project implementation would not impact the MHPA. All runoff shall be treated and shall not drain directly into the MHPA, to reduce impacts caused by the application or drainage of potentially harmful chemicals or by-products. Additionally, no trash, oil, parking, or other construction-related material or activities shall be allowed outside any approved construction limits.

Implementation of BMPs, along with regulatory compliance, would preclude any violations of applicable standards and discharge regulations. Therefore, potential impacts related to water quality and toxin runoff into the MHPA will be avoided through the above mentioned project design features.

**Lighting.** Per the MHPA Land Use Adjacency Guidelines, lighting within or adjacent to the MHPA shall be directed away/shielded from the MHPA and be subject to City of San Diego's Outdoor Lighting Regulations per Municipal Code Section 142.0740 (City of San Diego 1997). Per the City of San Diego Municipal Code

Section 142.0740, lighting of all developed areas within and adjacent to the MHPA shall be limited to lowlevel lighting and shielded to minimize the amount of light entering any sensitive biological resource areas (City of San Diego 2014).

Lighting for the project shall be responsive to the species in the area. Understanding that some species rely on darkness for shelter, feeding patterns, migrating, etc., the areas adjacent to any MHPA will be especially sensitive to light exposure in order to retain native characteristics. Only low-level outdoor lighting shall be used adjacent to the MHPA. All outdoor lighting adjacent to the MHPA shall be shielded and adjusted to fall on the same premises where such lights are located, in accordance with the City of San Diego Municipal Code 147.0740. Per the City's Municipal Code regulation, no light spill from outdoor lighting will occur within the MHPA. Thus, with San Diego Municipal Code compliance, potential lighting impacts into the MHPA will be avoided through the above-mentioned project design features.

**Noise.** Per the City of San Diego's Land Use Adjacency Guidelines, due to the site's location adjacent to or within the MHPA where the Qualified Biologist has identified potential nesting habitat for listed avian species, construction noise that exceeds the maximum levels allowed shall be avoided during the breeding seasons for the following: coastal California gnatcatcher (March 1–August 15). If construction is proposed during the breeding season of these species, United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) protocol surveys will be required in order to determine species presence/absence. If protocol surveys are not conducted in suitable habitat during the breeding season for the aforementioned listed species, presence shall be assumed with implementation of noise attenuation and biological monitoring. When applicable (i.e., habitat is occupied or if presence of the covered species is assumed), noise mitigation shall be incorporated (City of San Diego 1997).

Project compliance with mitigation measure LU-1 will reduce indirect impacts to nesting coastal California gnatcatcher from construction noise.

**Brush Management.** Per the City of San Diego's Land Use Adjacency Guidelines, new development adjacent to the MHPA shall be setback from the MHPA to provide required brush management zone 1 area on the building pad outside of the MHPA. Zone 2 may be located within the MHPA provided the zone 2 management will be the responsibility of a Homeowner's Association or other private entity except where narrow wildlife corridors require it to be located outside of the MHPA. Brush management zones will not be greater in size than currently required by the City of San Diego's regulations. Initial thinning of woody vegetation shall not exceed 50 percent of the existing vegetation prior to the implementation of Brush Management activities. Additional thinning and pruning shall be done consistent with City standards to obtain minimum vertical and horizontal clearances and shall avoid/minimize impacts to covered species to the maximum extent possible. Vegetation clearing shall be prohibited within native coastal sage scrub and chaparral habitats from March 1-August 15 except where the City of San Diego's Assistant Deputy Director/Mitigation Monitoring Coordinator has documented the thinning would be consist with the City of San Diego's MSCP Subarea Plan. For existing and approved projects, the brush management zones and clearing techniques will not change from those required by the regulations in effect at the time of approval (City of San Diego 1997).

All brush management zone 1 areas shall be outside of the MHPA. Brush management zone 2 areas located within the MHPA will not be used for mitigation. Brush management is required per the City

LDC Section 142.0412(i) and will avoid/minimize impacts to covered species to the maximum extent possible. Additionally, per Municipal Code 142.0412, non-native plants will be thinned preferentially over native plants. Therefore, per the above-mentioned LDC requirement, the project would be designed to adhere to the brush management MHPA guideline.

**Invasives.** *Per the MHPA Land Use Adjacency Guidelines, no invasive plant species shall be planted in or adjacent to the MHPA (City of San Diego 1997).* 

The planting palette for the project shall not include any invasive or non-native plant species adjacent to the MHPA. The following species will be planted directly adjacent to the MHPA: dwarf coyote brush (*Baccharis pilularis* 'Twin Peaks'), California poppy (*Eschscholzia californica*), deer grass (*Muhlenbergia rigens*), San Diego sunflower (*Bahiopsis laciniata*), and our Lord's candle (*Hesperoyucca whipplei*).

Existing invasive species shall be removed from the premises to the maximum extent practicable, consistent with Municipal Code Sections 142.0404(b)(2). Invasive species to be removed from the MHPA or within 100 feet include (but are not limited to) pampas grass, common poison hemlock, Russian thistle, Cootamundra wattle, western coastal wattle, Italian thistle, tree tobacco, scarlet pimpernel, English plantain, Australian saltbush, Peruvian pepper, and tocalote. Removal of small non-native annuals (e.g., tocalote and scarlet pimpernel) occurring within native habitats (e.g., coastal sage scrub) shall not be performed in such a way as to impact native flora and fauna. Therefore, per the above-mentioned San Diego Municipal Code requirement, the project will be designed to adhere to the invasive plant MHPA guideline.

**Grading/Land Development/MHPA Boundaries.** *Per the City of San Diego's Land Use Adjacency Guidelines, MHPA boundaries on-site and adjacent properties shall be delineated on the CDs. Development Services Department Planning and/or MSCP staff shall ensure that all grading is included within the development footprint, specifically manufactured slopes, disturbance, and development within or adjacent to the MHPA. For projects within or adjacent to the MHPA, all manufactured slopes associated with site development shall be included within the development footprint (City of San Diego 1997).* 

The proposed manufactured slopes for the project are within the development footprint and do not encroach into the MHPA. Therefore, the project is designed to avoid grading into the MHPA.

**Barriers/Access.** *Per the City of San Diego's Land Use Adjacency Guidelines, new development within or adjacent to the MHPA shall be required to provide barriers (e.g., non-invasive vegetation; rocks/boulders; 6-foot-high, vinyl-coated chain link or equivalent fences/walls; and/or signage) along the MHPA boundaries to direct public access to appropriate locations, reduce domestic animal predation, protect wildlife in the preserve, and provide adequate noise reduction where needed (City of San Diego 1997).* 

Along the southeastern project boundary, Campus Point Drive acts as a barrier to the MHPA. Steep slopes also occur along the southeastern and northeastern project boundary and act as a physical barrier for access into the MHPA. Additionally, access to trails outside of the project boundary shall be further restricted by the construction of Building B, a service yard, and landscape improvements. Therefore, the project is designed such that natural and existing barriers will limit access into the MHPA.

**Windows.** *Per the City of San Diego Municipal Code Section 142.0730, a maximum of 50 percent of the buildings shall be comprised of material with a light reflectivity factor greater than 30 percent (City of San Diego 2014).* 

Windows and building materials shall not use glazing with an outdoor visible light reflectivity greater than 55 percent in order to reduce the potential for bird strike. A maximum of 50 percent of the buildings shall be comprised of material with a light reflectivity factor greater than 30 percent, in accordance within the City of San Diego Municipal Code.

### 4.1.4.2 Significance of Impacts

Because the proposed development is located directly adjacent to the MHPA, there is a potential for indirect impacts. Indirect impacts to the MHPA would be considered significant.

### 4.1.4.3 Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting

#### LU-1:

- I. Prior to issuance of any construction permit or notice to proceed, DSD/LDR, and/or MSCP staff shall verify the Applicant has accurately represented the project's design in or on the Construction Documents (CDs/CDs consist of Construction Plan Sets for Private Projects and Contract Specifications for Public Projects) are in conformance with the associated discretionary permit conditions and Exhibit "A", and also the City's Multi-Species Conservation Program (MSCP) Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA) Land Use Adjacency Guidelines. The applicant shall provide an implementing plan and include references on/in CDs of the following:
  - A. **Grading/Land Development/MHPA Boundaries** MHPA boundaries on-site and adjacent properties shall be delineated on the CDs. DSD Planning and/or MSCP staff shall ensure that all grading is included within the development footprint, specifically manufactured slopes, disturbance, and development within or adjacent to the MHPA. For projects within or adjacent to the MHPA, all manufactured slopes associated with site development shall be included within the development footprint.
  - B. **Drainage** All new and proposed parking lots and developed areas in and adjacent to the MHPA shall be designed so they do not drain directly into the MHPA. All developed and paved areas must prevent the release of toxins, chemicals, petroleum products, exotic plant materials prior to release by incorporating the use of filtration devices, planted swales and/or planted detention/desiltation basins, or other approved permanent methods that are designed to minimize negative impacts, such as excessive water and toxins into the ecosystems of the MHPA.
  - C. **Toxics/Project Staging Areas/Equipment Storage** Projects that use chemicals or generate by-products such as pesticides, herbicides, and animal waste, and other substances that are potentially toxic or impactive to native habitats/flora/fauna

(including water) shall incorporate measures to reduce impacts caused by the application and/or drainage of such materials into the MHPA. No trash, oil, parking, or other construction/development-related material/activities shall be allowed outside any approved construction limits. Where applicable, this requirement shall incorporated into leases on publicly-owned property when applications for renewal occur. Provide a note in/on the CD's that states: *"All construction related activity that may have potential for leakage or intrusion shall be monitored by the Qualified Biologist/Owners Representative or Resident Engineer to ensure there is no impact to the MHPA."* 

- D. **Lighting** Lighting within or adjacent to the MHPA shall be directed away/shielded from the MHPA and be subject to City Outdoor Lighting Regulations per LDC Section 142.0740.
- E. **Barriers** New development within or adjacent to the MHPA shall be required to provide barriers (e.g., non-invasive vegetation; rocks/boulders; 6-foot high, vinyl-coated chain link or equivalent fences/walls; and/or signage) along the MHPA boundaries to direct public access to appropriate locations, reduce domestic animal predation, protect wildlife in the preserve, and provide adequate noise reduction where needed.
- F. **Invasives** No invasive non-native plant species shall be introduced into areas within or adjacent to the MHPA.
- G. **Brush Management** –New development adjacent to the MHPA shall be set back from the MHPA to provide required Brush Management Zone 1 area on the building pad outside of the MHPA. Zone 2 may be located within the MHPA provided the Zone 2 management will be the responsibility of an HOA or other private entity except where narrow wildlife corridors require it to be located outside of the MHPA. Brush management zones will not be greater in size than currently required by the City's regulations, the amount of woody vegetation clearing shall not exceed 50 percent of the vegetation existing when the initial clearing is done and vegetation clearing shall be prohibited within native coastal sage scrub and chaparral habitats from March 1-August 15 except where the City ADD/MMC has documented the thinning would be consist with the City's MSCP Subarea Plan. Existing and approved projects are subject to current requirements of Municipal Code Section 142.0412.
- H. Noise Due to the site's location adjacent to or within the MHPA where the Qualified Biologist has identified potential nesting habitat for listed avian species, construction noise that exceeds the maximum levels allowed shall be avoided during the breeding seasons for the following: California Gnatcatcher (3/1-8/15). If construction is proposed during the breeding season for the species, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service protocol surveys shall be required in order to determine species presence/absence. If protocol surveys are not conducted in suitable habitat during the breeding season for the aforementioned listed species, presence shall be assumed with implementation of noise attenuation and biological monitoring.

When applicable (i.e., habitat is occupied or if presence of the covered species is assumed), adequate noise reduction measures shall be incorporated as follows:

Coastal California Gnatcatcher (federally threatened)

Prior to the issuance of any grading permit, the City Manager (or appointed designee) shall verify that the MHPA boundaries and the following project requirements regarding the coastal California gnatcatcher are shown on the construction plans:

No clearing, grubbing, grading, or other construction activities shall occur between March 1 and August 15, the breeding season of the coastal California gnatcatcher, until the following requirements have been met to the satisfaction of the City Manager:

- A. A qualified biologist (possessing a valid Endangered Species Act Section 10(a)(1)(a) Recovery Permit) shall survey those habitat areas <u>within the MHPA</u> that would be subject to construction noise levels exceeding 60 decibels [dB(A)] hourly average for the presence of the coastal California gnatcatcher. Surveys for the coastal California gnatcatcher shall be conducted pursuant to the protocol survey guidelines established by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service within the breeding season prior to the commencement of any construction. If gnatcatchers are present, then the following conditions must be met:
  - i. Between March 1 and August 15, no clearing, grubbing, or grading of occupied gnatcatcher habitat shall be permitted. Areas restricted from such activities shall be staked or fenced under the supervision of a qualified biologist; <u>and</u>
  - Ii. Between March 1 and August 15, no construction activities shall occur within any portion of the site where construction activities would result in noise levels exceeding 60 dB(A) hourly average at the edge of occupied gnatcatcher habitat. an analysis showing that noise generated by construction activities would not exceed 60 dB(A) hourly average at the edge of occupied habitat must be completed by a qualified acoustician (possessing current noise engineer license or registration with monitoring noise level experience with listed animal species) and approved by the City Manager at least two weeks prior to the commencement of construction activities. Prior to the commencement of activities during the breeding season, areas restricted from such activities shall be staked or fenced under the supervision of a qualified biologist; <u>Or</u>
  - iii. At least two weeks prior to the commencement of construction activities, under the direction of a qualified acoustician, noise attenuation measures (e.g., berms, walls) shall be implemented to ensure that noise levels resulting from construction activities will not exceed 60 dB(A) hourly average at the edge of habitat occupied by the coastal california gnatcatcher. Concurrent with the commencement of construction activities and the construction of necessary noise attenuation facilities, noise monitoring\* shall be conducted at the edge of the occupied habitat area to ensure that noise levels do not exceed 60 dB(A)

hourly average. if the noise attenuation techniques implemented are determined to be inadequate by the qualified acoustician or biologist, then the associated construction activities shall cease until such time that adequate noise attenuation is achieved or until the end of the breeding season (August 16).

\*Construction noise monitoring shall continue to be monitored at least twice weekly on varying days, or more frequently depending on the construction activity, to verify that noise levels at the edge of occupied habitat are maintained below 60 dB(A) hourly average or to the ambient noise level if it already exceeds 60 dB(A) hourly average. If not, other measures shall be implemented in consultation with the biologist and the City Manager, as necessary, to reduce noise levels to below 60 dB(A) hourly average or to the ambient noise level if it already exceeds 60 dB(A) hourly average or to the ambient noise level if it already exceeds 60 dB(A) hourly average or to the ambient noise level if it already exceeds 60 dB(A) hourly average or to the ambient noise level if it already exceeds 60 dB(A) hourly average. Such measures may include, but are not limited to, limitations on the placement of construction equipment and the simultaneous use of equipment.

- B. If coastal California gnatcatchers are not detected during the protocol survey, the qualified biologist shall submit substantial evidence to the City Manager and applicable resource agencies which demonstrates whether or not mitigation measures such as noise walls are necessary between March 1 and August 15 as follows:
  - I. If this evidence indicates the potential is high for coastal California gnatcatcher to be present based on historical records or site conditions, then condition A.iii shall be adhered to as specified above.
  - ii. If this evidence concludes that no impacts to this species are anticipated, no mitigation measures would be necessary.

### 4.1.4.4 Level of Significance after Mitigation

Implementation of mitigation measure LU-1 would reduce the project's potential for indirect impacts to the MHPA to below a level of significance.

# 4.1.5 Issue 6: General Plan Noise/Land Use Compatibility

Would the project result in the exposure of people to noise levels which are incompatible with the Noise Compatibility Guidelines (Table NE-3) in the Noise Element of the General Plan?

### 4.1.5.1 Impacts

The project site is exposed to traffic noise from I-5, Campus Point Drive, and Genesee Avenue. Noise generated by future traffic was modeled using the Federal Highway Administration Traffic Noise Model Version 2.5 based on standard assumptions and existing and future (year 2035) traffic volumes from the project Traffic Impact Analysis. Refer to the noise technical report for additional details regarding noise modeling assumptions.

The City uses the General Plan's Land Use - Noise Compatibility Guidelines shown on Table NE-3 for evaluating land use noise compatibility when reviewing proposed land use development projects. A "compatible" land use indicates that standard construction methods will attenuate exterior noise to an acceptable indoor noise level and people can carry out outdoor activities with minimal noise interference. Evaluation of land use that falls into the "conditionally compatible" noise environment should have an acoustical study (San Diego General Plan, page NE-6; 2008). To determine whether interior and exterior noise levels are consistent with noise compatibility guidelines (Table NE-3), modeling of future noise levels was analyzed. Projected noise levels were modeled for a series of 26 receivers to determine noise levels at the façade of the proposed new buildings to determine interior noise conformance. Noise levels were modeled at four receivers located at the exterior use areas, including a basketball court and outdoor seating areas to determine exterior noise conformance.

Exterior noise levels at the façade of the buildings (Receivers 1 through 26) are projected to range from 42 to 75 A-weighted decibels community noise equivalent level [dB(A) CNEL]. Considering the 25 dB noise attenuation provided by standard office-type buildings (Federal Highway Administration 2011), interior noise levels would be 50 dB(A) CNEL or less. The City's General Plan interior noise standard is 50 dB(A) CNEL for research and development uses. The project is also designed to achieve Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design certification and would likely achieve even greater reduction. This certification would require several energy and insulation-efficiency measures to be included in the design of the structures. Thus, interior noise levels of the proposed buildings would not exceed the General Plan "compatible" standard for research and development land uses and no interior noise compatibility impact would occur.

First-floor exterior noise levels at all receivers would range from 42 to 63 CNEL. Thus, exterior noise levels at all exterior use areas would be less than the General Plan 70 dB(A) CNEL exterior noise level threshold. Exterior noise impacts would therefore be less than significant.

### 4.1.5.2 Significance of Impacts

Interior noise levels would be less than the City's General Plan 50 dB(A) CNEL identified for research and development land uses. Additionally, noise levels at the exterior use areas would not exceed the General Plan's 70 dB(A) CNEL for research and development land uses. Therefore, noise impacts would be less than significant.

### 4.1.5.3 Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting

Impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

## 4.1.6 Issues 7 and 8: MCAS Miramar ALUCP Compatibility

Would the project result in land uses which are not compatible with an adopted Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) including aircraft noise levels as defined by the MCAS Miramar ALUCP?

### 4.1.6.1 Impacts

#### a. ALUCP Conditionally Compatible Use

The MCAS Miramar ALUCP identifies the Research and Development Use as a conditionally compatible use, restricted to 0.34 FAR and a maximum usage intensity of 50 persons per acre. A Neighborhood Development Permit for an alternative method of calculation is being requested, as detailed in Municipal Code Section 132.1515(d), in order to demonstrate compliance with the 50 persons per acre maximum usage while exceeding the 0.34 FAR. The "alternative calculation" is based upon the total number of people that will be allowed on-site.

The maximum number of people allowed by the ALUCP within APZII is calculated as 50 persons per acre, or 2,909 people for the 58.19-acre project site. The project will be conditioned to limit the total number of people allowed on the site to 2,909 people.

### b. ALUCP Consistency

The ALUCP requires that proposed community plan amendments and rezones be submitted to the Airport Land Use Commission for a consistency determination with the applicable ALUCP. A consistency determination from the San Diego County Regional Airport Authority is required prior to approval pursuant to Municipal Code Section 132.1550(c)(4). The Airport Land Use Commission determined that the project would be consistent with the ALUCP (Resolution No. 2015-005; Appendix B). More specifically, the Airport Land Use Commission resolutions indicate the project would be compatible with the MCAS Miramar noise levels and APZ II land use and intensity restrictions. Thus, airport compatibility impacts would be less than significant.

The MCAS Miramar runways are approximately four miles southeast of the project site. Figure 4.1-3 shows the aircraft noise contours for MCAS Miramar. As shown, the project lies approximately 1,000 feet outside the 60 CNEL contour line. Therefore, aircraft operations would not result in significant noise or vibration impacts to the project.

#### c. Federal Aviation Administration Noticing

The project is within the FAA Part 77 Noticing Area for MCAS Miramar. The project was accordingly submitted to the FAA for review, and the FAA issued a Determination of No Hazard to Air Navigation on January 20, 2015 (see Appendix B). The FAA determined that the project would not penetrate the Part 77 100:1 notification surface area, as the difference between the lowest Part 77 notification surface and the highest elevation of grade equals 300 feet and no structures are proposed more than 197 feet above grade. Thus, the project would comply with FAA regulations and would have no impact to air navigation.

### 4.1.6.2 Significance of Impacts

The project would be consistent with the MCAS Miramar ALUCP, would meet the alternative compliance intensity limits, and is outside the 60 CNEL contour of MCAS Miramar. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

### 4.1.6.3 Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting

Impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

## 4.1.7 Issue 9: Land Development Code Compliance

Would the project require a deviation or variance, and would the deviation or variance in turn result in a physical impact on the environment?

### 4.1.7.1 Impacts

The LDC contains Steep Hillside Guidelines that provide standards and guidelines intended to assist in the interpretation and implementation of the development regulations for steep hillsides contained in Chapter 14, Article 3, Division 1, ESL. The project site contains steep hillsides at the west, north, and eastern borders of the project site. However, the project would avoid encroachment into steep hillsides, and is, therefore, not subject to the ESL regulations or the Steep Hillside Guidelines. The project was designed to stay within the existing limits of disturbance and would not require any grading within steep slopes. The project does not require any deviations or variances from the LDC.

### 4.1.4.2 Significance of Impacts

The project does not require any deviations or variances from the LDC that would result in a physical impact on the environment. Thus, no impact would occur.



2,000 0 Feet

**Miramar Airfield Noise Contours** 

Off-site Improvement Area



FIGURE 4.1-3

Aircraft Noise Contours for MCAS Miramar

### 4.1.4.3 Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting

No impact would occur; thus, no mitigation is required.

## 4.1.8 Comparison to the 1993 FEIR

The 1993 FEIR concluded that the project would conflict with the environmental goals and objectives of the Community Plan, thus causing a significant land use impact, because of the cumulatively significant air, noise, and traffic impacts associated with the additional trips generated by the project. As discussed in Section 4.1.3 above, the project no longer has cumulative air or noise impacts and would mitigate all of its traffic impacts to below a level of significance with the exception of the impacts at I-5 and Genesee. However, the improvements at I-5 and Genesee Avenue are currently underway and are outside the control of the applicant. In addition, the proposed Community Plan Amendment would remove the requirement to mitigate peak hour trips to the equivalent of 18,000 sf/ac. Thus, while impacts at the Genesee segment and the I-5 southbound ramps would be considered temporarily significant and unmitigated, no significant secondary land use impacts would occur.

The 1993 FEIR concluded that the project would be consistent with the Naval Air Station Miramar CLUP and that impacts to the CLUP and airfield operations would be less than significant. The CLUP has been updated/superseded by the ALUCP prepared and adopted for MCAS Miramar in October 2008; nevertheless, the project would be consistent with the MCAS Miramar ALUCP, meets the alternative compliance intensity limits, and is outside the 60 CNEL contour of MCAS Miramar. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

The issues of MSCP and LDC compliance, as well as General Plan Noise compatibility, were not addressed in the 1993 FEIR. As discussed in Sections 4.1.4, 4.1.5, and 4.1.7, the project is required to comply with the MHPA Land Use Adjacency Guidelines (LU-1) in order to reduce indirect impacts to below a level of significance. Further, interior noise levels would be less than the City's General Plan 50 dB(A) CNEL identified for research and development land uses; and the project does not require any deviations or variances to the LDC.

	Table 4.1-1 Summary of Project Consistency with Applicable Land Use Plans Goals and Objectives					
Goals		Consistency Evaluation				
UN	UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY PLAN					
Со	mmunity Goals					
<u>Overall Goals</u>		The project would provide new entry monuments to reflect the additional tenants				
a.	Foster a sense of community identity by use of attractive entry monuments in private developments.	which would occupy the proposed new building.				
b.	Create a physical, social and economic environment complementary to UCSD and its environs and the entire San Diego metropolitan area.	The project would expand the scientific research and development campus near UCSD and contribute additional employment opportunities for the San Diego area.				
c.	Develop the University area as a self-sufficient community offering a balance of housing, employment, business, cultural, educational and recreational opportunities	The project would expand the scientific research and development campus resulting in an increase of employment opportunities for residents of the University Community and San Diego at large.				
d.	Develop an equitable allocation of development intensity among properties, based on the concept of the "urban node."	The project would not conflict with the urban node concept and associated intensities designated by the University Community Plan (UCP), as the development intensity proposed would be consistent with 30,000 sq. ft. per acre intensity identified for the project site in the UCP.				
e.	Provide a workable circulation system which accommodates anticipated traffic without reducing the Level of Service below "D."	While the project would result in significant traffic impacts (Impacts TR-1 through TR- 5), the project would mitigate all these impacts to below a level of significance with the exception of the two temporary impacts at the Interstate 5 (I-5)/Genesee Avenue interchange. The I-5/Genesee Avenue interchange would operate at an unacceptable level of service (LOS) without the project, but the project itself would not reduce the LOS below D. In addition, improvement of the interchange is under Caltrans' jurisdiction, is under construction, and will be completed in 2017. Therefore, the project would not conflict with this goal. Refer to Section 4.2 for additional details.				

	Table 4.1-1 Summary of Project Consistency with Applicable Land Use Plans Goals and Objectives					
	Goals	Consistency Evaluation				
	nployment Goals Promote job opportunities within the University community. Encourage the development of life sciences- research facilities which maximize the resources of the University.	The project would expand the scientific research and development campus resulting in an increase of employment opportunities within the University community.				
<u>O</u> g.	<b>pen Space Goals</b> Preserve the natural environment including wildlife, vegetation and terrain.	The project site includes sensitive biological resources and steep hillsides. No deviation would be required and no impacts associated with steep slopes requirements would occur. The project would preserve sensitive vegetation to and would be consistent with the City's Biology Guidelines as well as the Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP).				
	<b>ublic Facilities and Services Goal</b> Ensure that schools, parks, police and fire protection, sewer and water, library and other public facilities are available concurrently with the development which they are to serve.	The City of San Diego collects impact fees from new development to assist in funding community-wide public services, utilities, and facilities, and as a means to offset new development's impact on infrastructure and public services. Facilities Benefit Assessments (FBA) generally provide funds for public facilities project which service a designated area of benefit and are identified in the Public Facilities Financing Plan (PFFP). The FBA fees are based upon the cost of each public facility equitably distributed over a designated area of benefit in the community planning area. Fees are paid on the actual development when permits are issued and pursuant to Senate Bill 50, are considered to fully mitigate for school impacts associated with that development. The project would comply with all City of San Diego policies regarding the payment of FBA fees to ensure that the development would not significantly impact existing and future utilities.				
<u>Tr</u> i.	Tansportation GoalsEncourage alternative modes of transportationby requiring developer participation in transitfacility improvements, the Intra-CommunityShuttle Loop and the Light Rail Transit (LRT)system.Ensure implementation of City Council Policy600-34, Transit Planning and Development.	The project would include a transportation demand management (TDM) program that would encourage alternative modes of transportation. The program would include bike lockers, showers, shuttle system to local transit centers, discounted transit passes and a bike share program. Refer to Section 3.32.5 for additional details. City Council Policy 600-34 was repealed by Resolution R-307565 – 07-20-2012. The City of San Diego General Plan, UCP and the Land Development Code (LDC) address transit planning and development.				
Table 4.1-1 Summary of Project Consistency with Applicable Land Use Plans Goals and Objectives						
---	--					
Goals	Consistency Evaluation					
<ul> <li><u>Community Environment Goals</u></li> <li>j.</li> <li>Minimize the impact of aircraft noise and the consequences of potential aircraft accidents.</li> <li>Foster individuality and identity of area</li> </ul>	The project site lies approximately 1,000 feet outside the 60 community noise equivalent level (CNEL) contour line for the Marine Corps Air Station (MCAS) Miramar. Therefore, aircraft operations would not result in significant noise or vibration impacts to the project. The Campus Point Master Plan design guidelines emphasize the sustainable high tech					
<ul> <li>throughout the community.</li> <li>Ensure that the physical development of the community takes advantage of the site and terrain.</li> </ul>	image that the project would convey through architectural design, building placement, and landscape design. The project would employ a TDM in order to encourage alternative modes of travel, as					
<ul> <li>Encourage architectural styles and building forms suited to San Diego's landscape and climate.</li> <li>Limit traffic conditions which produce congestion and air pollution.</li> <li>Provide street and median trees along streets within the community.</li> </ul>	discussed above. Existing street trees are located along Campus Point Drive and would remain.					
Industrial Goals a. Emphasize the citywide importance of and encourage the location of scientific research uses in the North University City area because of its proximity to UCSD.	The project would expand the scientific research and development on the site allowing for additional research and development activities to take place near UCSD.					
Urban Design Element						
a. Improve accessibility and use relationships within the community by establishing well- defined, multi-modal linkage systems.	Pedestrian paths would be incorporated into the site and would provide linkages to the off-site pedestrian paths. In addition, the project would include a shuttle to the University Towne Center (UTC) and Sorrento Valley transit stations and also provide on-site bike lockers.					
<ul> <li>Establish standards which give physical design direction to private developments and public improvements.</li> </ul>	A set of design guidelines are included with the Master Plan for the project site. The guidelines address the recommendations for the Central Subarea and establish site and building design criteria.					

	Table 4.1-1 Summary of Project Consistency with Applicable Land Use Plans Goals and Objectives	
	Goals	Consistency Evaluation
c.	Provide for the needs of pedestrians in all future design and development decisions.	Pedestrian paths throughout the campus provide linkages to the activity areas and recreational amenities on site and to the pedestrian paths outside the project site.
d.	Ensure that San Diego's climate and the community's unique topography and vegetation influence the planning and design of new projects	The project would limit the development area to those areas previously developed to the maximum extent practical. Steep slopes and sensitive biological resources would be preserved to the maximum extent feasible (see Sections 4.1.7 and 4.3.2). The project would create outdoor useable areas and promote pedestrian travel between buildings consistent with the local climate.
e.	Ensure that every new development contributes to the public realm and street livability by providing visual amenities and a sense of place.	The proposed master plan includes additional landscaping elements, hardscaping, native plants, gardens, and pedestrian scale use areas (see Figures 3-7, 3-8a, and 3- 8b). This includes landscaping improvements along Campus Point Drive that would positively contribute to the aesthetics of the area and would be consistent with the UCP design approaches described further below.
f.	<i>Central Subarea Objective</i> Improve the central community's urban form and cohesiveness as new construction activity continues.	The Campus Point Master Plan design guidelines emphasize the sustainable high tech image that the project will convey through architectural design, building placement, and landscape design.

Table 4.1-1 Summary of Project Consistency with Applicable Land Use Plans Goals and Objectives	
Goals	Consistency Evaluation
<ul> <li>g. Central Subarea Design Approach (summarized)</li> <li>Setbacks</li> <li>Transitioning building scale and height</li> <li>Placing lower buildings near the street and taller buildings away from the street in large scale projects.</li> <li>Siting and designing buildings to maximize solar access and view corridors.</li> <li>Articulating the building mass with offsets, changes of plane, stepped terraces and irregular architectural edges.</li> <li>Utilizing building elements, colors and materials that are not disturbing to the eye.</li> <li>Concealing rooftop equipment, trash storage and utilities.</li> <li>Roads and open space coordinated with adjacent properties.</li> <li>Avoiding the location of service roads and</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>The project has been designed to follow the Central Subarea design approach goals.</li> <li>These guidelines include site design; building placement, massing, and general design; entries, building finishes, and glazing; parapet, roof, and screening; parking structure; and lighting guidance.</li> <li>Site Design</li> <li>The following general guidelines have been incorporated into the site design: <ul> <li>Buildings shall be sited and designed to maximize solar access and view corridors. Plazas should be located with the thought of sun access and sun shading.</li> <li>Pedestrian walkways shall be provided to connect with existing and other pedestrian paths outside of the project site.</li> <li>Pedestrian walkways shall be designed to clearly demarcate main building entrances.</li> <li>Site elements such as water fountains are encouraged at public points of interest for the enjoyment of employees and distinction of important areas such as plazas.</li> <li>Parking shall be in unobtrusive and convenient locations. Surface lots shall be dispersed in multiple increments. Large, single expanses of surface parking should be avoided. Surface parking landscaping shall conform to the</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
fire lanes parallel to the public street.	City's Landscape Technical Manual.

Table 4.1-1 Summary of Project Consistency with Applicable Land Use Plans Goals and Objectives	
Goals	Consistency Evaluation
<ul> <li>Central Subarea Design Approach (continued)</li> <li>Providing internal private drive sidewalks that connect with other pedestrian paths on- and off-site.</li> <li>Orienting land uses not sensitive to freeway noise such as parking and storage, towards I-805.</li> <li>Reducing noise effects from I-805 by landscaped berms.</li> <li>Avoiding the location of parking and parking entrances adjacent to the pedestrian network streets, and avoiding large expansive parking lots.</li> <li>Integrating logo signage into the site and building design.</li> </ul>	Building Placement, Massing, and General DesignSpecial consideration has been given to building massing and site planning that would maximize open space and views between buildings and surrounding views. Sensitive treatment of landscape, setbacks, building massing, building systems, and fenestrations would promote the corporate image that is intended.Combinations of structural systems and building massing would allow for sufficient
	flexibility in designing the buildings to be able to achieve an individual identity within the design concept and architectural objectives established for the project as a whole. Each building may have unique features, though they would be cohesive with the overall development. Building mass may be articulated with offsets, change of planes, and parapet height. The base of buildings shall relate to the pedestrian in scale, color, architectural detailing, and visual interest.
	<b>Entries, Building Finishes, and Glazing</b> In order to clearly articulate building entrances and enhance the aesthetic quality of entrances, each building shall have a unique and distinct entry using elements such as frames, metal awnings, projecting roof elements, and special glazing. All aspects of entry design shall give a sense of arrival and be welcoming at the pedestrian level. Building materials shall relate and complement the materials used in the existing complex, such as concrete, metal, and a variety of glass. Use of contrasting materials may be appropriate accents. Special attention should be paid to the selection of sustainable and recycled materials that advance the Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) goals and resource conservation.
	Fenestration treatments shall be simple and straightforward in order to convey a sleek and contemporary image. Buildings shall minimize light and glare reflectivity to adjacent roads and buildings through necessary building articulation and selection of exterior building materials. Glazing with an outdoor visible light reflectivity greater than 30 percent shall not be used. Glazing in colors and level of transparency that harmonize with the overall existing color palette shall be used. Mullions shall be detailed in a variety of ways, such as highly expressed, minimized, or directional on a horizontal/vertical plane.

Table 4.1-1 Summary of Project Consistency with Applicable Land Use Plans Goals and Objectives	
Goals	Consistency Evaluation
Central Subarea Design Approach (continued)	Parapet, Roof, and Screening Parapet articulation shall fit the contemporary architectural style of the existing building. Façade glazing may extend above the roof line as an extension of the façade and be of the correct opacity to obscure all structural and mechanical elements. Lighting and signage may be used on the upper portion of the buildings in ways not to overpower the overall building design and reflect the quality of materials.
	Roofs are appropriate for sustainable features such as water reclamation, photovoltaic panels, and solar reflectance to minimize the heat island effect. The addition of roof-mounted solar arrays shall be treated as an integral design element that complements the overall building design. All other rooftop equipment shall be fully screened and integrated into the building design.
	Exterior screens are vital to the articulation of façades, roofs, and overall design. Screens shall be of a superior quality and may be used in a variety of methods for visual interest. Vegetative or metal screens should be used to protect the buildings from solar heat gain and would aesthetically contribute to the overall design.
	<b>Parking Structures</b> All parking structures shall be designed to complement the surrounding buildings. Structures will be made of concrete and feature architectural screens on all sides facing development. Examples of screens include vegetative, perforated metal panel, lightweight metal structure, wood, and glass. Roof-mounted photovoltaic shall be provided to shade parking and would contribute to the overall aesthetic of the structures. The structures shall be designed to be efficient and cohesive with the overall design of the campus. Use of parking ramps is encouraged in lieu of speed ramps for a more efficient structure and smaller physical footprint.
	<b>Lighting</b> Particular attention should be paid to the compatibility of light fixtures and lamp types, both throughout the site as well as on the buildings. To ensure design unity within the campus, a consistent lighting theme should be followed.

	Table 4.1-1 Summary of Project Consistency with Applicable Land Use Plans Goals and Objectives	
	Goals	Consistency Evaluation
Tra	ansportation Element	
a.	Provide a network of transportation systems that are integrated, complementary and compatible with other citywide and regional goals. The network should take into account the physical, social, economic and environmental conditions of the community, both present and future.	The project would provide mitigation for traffic impacts except the project's significant impacts to the I-5/Genesee Avenue interchange (Impact-TR-3 and Impact TR-4) that would be temporarily unmitigated until Caltrans completes its planned, fully funded and under construction I-5/ Genesee Avenue Interchange project in fall 2017. These improvements are out of the control of the applicant. Therefore, the project would not conflict with this goal. Refer to Section 4.2 for additional details.
b.	Provide a balanced public transportation system to link the entire community to all of its own activity areas and to the San Diego metropolitan area as a whole.	The project would include a TDM program to promote a balanced and linked transportation system. Refer to Section 3.2.5 for additional details.
c.	Encourage alternative modes of transportation by requiring developer participation in transit facility improvements, the Intra-Community Shuttle Loop and the LRT line.	The project would include a TDM program that promotes transit use and includes a private shuttle to the UTC and Sorrento Valley transit centers. Refer to Section 3.3.5 for additional details.
d.	Develop an equitable allocation of development intensity among properties, based on the concept of the urban node.	The project would not conflict with the urban node concept and associated intensities designated by the UCP, as the development intensity proposed would be consistent with 30,000 sq. ft. per acre intensity identified for the project site in the UCP. Thus, the project would be developed at an intensity that fits well into its surroundings and will provide jobs in the community.
e.	Provide a workable circulation system which accommodates anticipated traffic without reducing the Level of Service below "D."	While the project would result in significant traffic impacts (Impacts TR-1 through TR- 5), the project would mitigate all these impacts to below a level of significance with the exception of the two temporary impacts at the I-5/Genesee Avenue interchange. The I-5/Genesee Avenue interchange would operate at an unacceptable LOS without the project but the project itself would not reduce the LOS below D. In addition, improvement of the interchange is under Caltrans' jurisdiction, and is under construction to be completed in the fall of 2017. Therefore, the project would not conflict with this objective. Refer to Section 4.2 for additional details.

	Table 4.1-1 Summary of Project Consistency with Applicable Land Use Plans Goals and Objectives		
	Goals	Consistency Evaluation	
Inc	dustrial Element		
a.	Ensure that industrial land needs as required for a balanced economy and balanced land use are met consistent with environmental considerations.	The site is designated for scientific research use. The project would expand the existing use.	
b.	Protect a reserve of manufacturing land from encroachment by non-manufacturing uses.	The project would expand the existing scientific research use of the site. Incompatible uses are not proposed.	
C.	Encourage the development of industrial land uses that are compatible with adjacent non- industrial uses and match the skills of the local labor force.	The project consists of intensifying an existing scientific research and development site that is adjacent to similar industrial land uses, which would be consistent with this goal.	
d.	Emphasize the citywide importance of and encourage the location of scientific research uses in the North University area because of its proximity to UCSD.	The project would expand the existing scientific research use of a site in the northern University area consistent with this goal.	
Op	en Space and Recreation Element Goal		
a.	Preserve the natural resources of the community through the appropriate designation and use of open space. Major topographic features and biological resources should be preserved as undeveloped open space.	The project site includes sensitive biological resources and steep hillsides. The project would however focus the proposed development within the existing developed portion of the site and would maximize the preservation of the natural resources on- site. Therefore the project would preserve sensitive biological resources and steep hillsides consistent with this goal.	
No	bise		
a.	Minimize and avoid adverse noise impacts by planning for the appropriate placement and intensity of land uses relative to noise sources.	The project would be consistent with noise standards as discussed in Section 8.6.	
Sa	Safety		
a.	Protect the public health and safety by guiding future development so that land use is compatible with identified geologic risks, including seismic and landslide hazards.	The project would be required to implement proper engineering design and utilize standard construction practices in compliance with regulations, which would avoid potential impacts from regional geologic hazards (see Section 8.1).	

	Table 4.1-1 Summary of Project Consistency with Applicable Land Use Plans Goals and Objectives	
	Goals	Consistency Evaluation
b.	Ensure that proposed development does not create or increase geologic hazards either on- or off-site.	The project would be required to implement proper engineering design and utilize standard construction practices in compliance with regulations, which would avoid potential impacts from regional geologic hazards (see Section 8.1).
с.	Promote public safety by taking into account aircraft accident potential in the placement of structures and activities.	The project would comply with the MCAS Miramar Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) and Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) requirements. The ALUC has issued a resolution stating that the project is consistent with the MCAS Miramar ALUCP and the FAA has also issued a Determination of No Hazard (see Appendix B). Refer to Section 4.1.6 for additional details.
Re	source Management Element	
a.	Preserve the community's natural topography, particularly in the coastal zone and in major canyon systems.	The project site has been previously developed and new development is proposed within the previous development footprint. Therefore, there would be no encroachment into steep slopes thus resulting in minimal impacts to natural topography. The site is not located in the coastal zone. Thus, the project would be consistent with this goal.
b.	Protect biological resources through the wise management and use of community's natural open space and parks.	The project would focus its development within the existing development footprint, and would minimize impacts to the adjacent open space. The project would comply with the MSCP Land Use Adjacency Guidelines. Potentially significant indirect impacts to the MHPA would be mitigated to below a level of significance (see Sections 4.1 and 4.3). The project would provide a covenant of easement to ensure preservation of the on-site open space. Thus, the project is consistent with this goal.
с.	Encourage the conservation of water in the design and construction of buildings and in landscaping.	The project has been designed to comply with the City's Climate Change and Sustainable Development goals contained in the General Plan's Conservation Element. Project design features would serve to reduce or avoid potential environmental effects associated with water consumption, including the proposed low water use plant palette and efficient irrigation design (see Figures 3-8a and 3-8b). The project would be constructed in accordance with the California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen) and would incorporate green building design that includes water conservation. The project is designed to achieve LEED Silver certification.

	Table 4.1-1 Summary of Project Consistency with Applicable Land Use Plans Goals and Objectives	
	Goals	Consistency Evaluation
d.	Reduce energy consumption by requiring energy efficiency in building design and landscaping and by planning for a self- contained community and energy-efficient transportation.	The project has been designed to comply with the City's Climate Change and Sustainable Development goals contained in the General Plan's Conservation Element. Project design features would serve to reduce or avoid potential environmental effects associated with energy consumption. The project would be constructed in accordance with CALGreen and would incorporate green building design with improved energy efficiency. The project is designed to achieve LEED Silver certification.
e.	Provide for the identification and recovery of significant paleontological resources.	As detailed in Section 4.5, the project mitigation includes construction monitoring to provide for the identification and recovery of significant paleontological resources during grading. Thus, the project would be consistent with this goal.
f.	Ensure the effective preservation and management of significant archaeological and historic resources.	As detailed in Section 4.4, the project mitigation includes construction monitoring to provide for the identification and recovery of any unknown subsurface significant archaeological during grading. Thus, the project would be consistent with this goal.
-	y of San Diego General Plan	
Ар	<ul> <li>nd Use and Community Planning Element</li> <li>plicable Goals:</li> <li><u>City of Villages Strategy</u></li> <li>Mixed use villages throughout the City connected by high-quality transit.</li> </ul>	The project site is in an area identified as having a low village propensity in the General Plan. The General Plan does identify the site as Prime Industrial Land and part of a Subregional Employment Center. The expansion of the scientific research and development use would be consistent with land use goals of the element.
D.	<ul> <li><u>Plan Amendment Process</u></li> <li>Approve plan amendments that better implement the General Plan and community plan goals and policies</li> <li>Allow for changes that will assist in enhancing and implementing the</li> </ul>	The project proposes an amendment to the UCP, in order to remove the requirement to reduce peak-hour traffic generation. The intensification of on-site research and development use is consistent with the Economic Prosperity Element goal for Prime Industrial Land, as well as with the Subregional Employment Center.

Table 4.1-1 Summary of Project Consistency with Applicable Land Use Plans Goals and Objectives	
Goals	Consistency Evaluation
<ul> <li>G. <u>Airport Land Use Compatibility</u></li> <li>Protection of the public health, safety, and welfare of persons within an airport influence area by minimizing the public's exposure to high levels of noise and accident risk.</li> <li>Protection of public use airports and military air installations from the encroachment of incompatible land uses within an airport influence area that could unduly constrain airport operations.</li> </ul>	The project site is located within the airport influence area for MCAS Miramar, and within the Accident Potential Zone (APZ) II. The project would be compatible with the adopted ALUCP and FAA requirements. The project land use and intensity would be consistent with those allowed on the site per the ALUCP (see Section 4.1.6 and Appendix B).
Mobility Element	The internal pedestrian system and pedestrian linkages proposed for the project
Applicable goals:	would provide connectivity. Trees and landscaping would be planted to provide shade
<ul> <li>A. <u>Walkable Communities</u> <ul> <li>A safe and comfortable pedestrian environment.</li> <li>A complete, functional and interconnected pedestrian network, that is accessible to pedestrians of all abilities.</li> <li>Greater walkability achieved through pedestrian-friendly street, site and building design.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	and visual interest.
<ul> <li>B. <u>Transit</u></li> <li>Increased transit ridership.</li> </ul>	The project would include a TDM program to promote alternative transportation, including transit use. The program would include a shuttle system to the UTC and Sorrento Valley transit centers and 25 percent discounted transit passes. Refer to Section 3.3.5 for additional details.

Table 4.1-1 Summary of Project Consistency with Applicable Land Use Plans Goals and Objectives	
Goals	Consistency Evaluation
<ul> <li>D. <u>Street and Freeway System</u></li> <li>An interconnected street system that provides multiple linkages within and between communities.</li> <li>Vehicle congestion relief.</li> <li>Safe and efficient street design that</li> </ul>	The current interconnected street system and layout would not be changed with the implementation of this project as the project would not impede or block access to surrounding communities. In addition, from Campus Point Drive pedestrians can utilize the sidewalks to reach the rest of the community. The project would include a TDM program to promote alternative transportation that
<ul> <li>minimizes environmental and neighborhood impacts.</li> <li>Well maintained streets.</li> </ul>	would help alleviate vehicular congestion through a variety of carpooling and bicycle benefits as well as encouraging telecommuting and staggered work hours.
	Currently, the private driveway and Campus Point Drive were designed with a pedestrian and bicycle safety zone (sidewalks) that will continue to serve future tenants. In addition, no environmental or neighborhood impacts would be created through the restriping/road widening, and installation of new signals as the off-site street improvements areas are located in existing development and does not access local neighborhoods. The streets will continue to be maintained accordingly.
E. <u>Transportation Demand Management</u>	The project would include a TDM program to promote alternative transportation. The
<ul> <li>Reduced single-occupant vehicular traffic on congested streets and freeways.</li> <li>Expanded travel options and improved personal mobility.</li> </ul>	program would include a row program to promote alternative transportation. The program would include carpooling incentives, carpooling priority parking, carpooling association, bike lockers, showers, shuttle system to UTC and Sorrento Valley transit centers, 25 percent discounted transit passes and a bike share program. Refer to Section 3.3.5 for additional details.
<ul> <li>F. <u>Bicycling</u></li> <li>A city where bicycling is a viable travel choice, particularly for trips of less than five miles.</li> </ul>	The project would provide 157 short term bicycle parking spaces, 189 long-term bicycle parking spaces, and showers to encourage bicycling as an alternative transportation option for employees. The TDM program would also include a bike share program. Refer to Section 3.3.5 for additional details.

Table 4.1-1 Summary of Project Consistency with Applicable Land Use Plans Goals and Objectives		
Goals	Consistency Evaluation	
<ul> <li>G. <u>Parking Management</u></li> <li>Parking that is reasonably available when and where it is needed through management of the supply.</li> <li>Increased land use efficiencies in the provision of parking.</li> </ul>	The majority of the existing surface parking lots on-site would be replaced by parking structures and subsurface parking would be provided, which would promote land use efficiencies in the provision of parking.	
<ul> <li>Urban Design Element <ul> <li>Applicable goals:</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. <u>General Urban Design</u> <ul> <li>A built environment that respects San Diego's natural environment and climate.</li> <li>An improved quality of life through safe and secure neighborhoods and public places.</li> <li>A pattern and scale of development that provides visual diversity, choice of lifestyle, and opportunities for social interaction.</li> <li>A City with distinctive districts, communities, neighborhoods, and village centers where people gather and interact.</li> <li>Utilization of landscape as an important aesthetic and unifying element throughout the City.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	The Master Plan design guidelines emphasize the sustainable high tech image that the project would convey through architectural design, building placement, and landscape design. Recreational amenities would be provided on-site and offer outdoor and indoor gathering places for employees and visitors. The project would preserve environmentally sensitive lands and develop within the existing footprint. The landscape design would comply with the City's requirements and would be utilized as an important aesthetic element. Refer to the UCP Central Subarea Plan design goals analysis above. The project is not located in a village center area.	

Table 4.1-1 Summary of Project Consistency with Applicable Land Use Plans Goals and Objectives					
Goals Consistency Evaluation					
<ul> <li>D. <u>Office and Business Park Development</u></li> <li>Promote the enhanced visual quality of office and industrial development.</li> <li>Provide increased pedestrian-and transit-orientation within office and industrial developments.</li> </ul>	The Master Plan design guidelines emphasize the sustainable high tech image that the project would convey through architectural design, building placement, and landscape design. The closest bus line is approximately 0.75 mile from the property. The project applicant will provide a shuttle system once occupancy reaches 75 percent. The shuttle will connect the property with the UTC and Sorrento Valley transit centers.				
	Other incentives for future tenants to utilize alternative forms of transportation will be provided, including discounted transit passes and vouchers.				
Economic Prosperity Element Applicable goals: A. <u>Industrial Use</u> Efficient <u>use</u> of existing employment lands.	The project intensifies scientific research and development uses on the project site, which is located in employment lands. Therefore, the project would be consistent with this goal.				
EP-A.1. Protect base sector uses that provide quality job opportunities including middle-income jobs; provide for secondary employment and supporting uses; and maintain areas where smaller emerging industrial uses can locate in a multi-tenant setting. When updating community plans or considering plan amendments, the industrial land use designations contained in the Land Use and Community Planning Element should be appropriately applied to protect viable sites for base sector and related employment uses.	The project would provide the region with additional job opportunities in the life science and biotech industries, which would be consistent with this goal.				
EP-A.2. Encourage a broader geographic distribution of high technology businesses throughout the City.	The project would increase intensity on an existing research and development site. While this would not provide a broader geographic distribution of high technology businesses, the project would not conflict with this goal.				
EP-A.3. Encourage large regional employers to locate and expand in the Regional Center or Subregional Employment Areas.	The site is located in the University/Sorrento Mesa Regional Center and Subregional Employment Area. Consistent with this goal, the project would expand an existing research and development facility within a designated Industrial Employment area.				

Table 4.1-1 Summary of Project Consistency with Applicable Land Use Plans Goals and Objectives				
Goals	Consistency Evaluation			
EP-A.4. Include base sector uses appropriate to an	The site is located in an area designated with a low propensity for village			
office setting in Urban Village and Community	development. Thus, this policy does not apply to the project.			
Village Centers.				
EP-A.5. Consider the redesignation of non- industrial properties to industrial use where land use conflicts can be minimized. Evaluate the	The project will redevelop/expand on land that is in existing development and was previously disturbed.			
<ul> <li>extent to which the proposed designation and subsequent industrial development would: <ul> <li>Accommodate the expansion of existing industrial uses to facilitate their retention in the area in which they are located.</li> <li>Not intrude into existing residential neighborhoods or disrupt existing commercial activities and other uses.</li> <li>Mitigate any environmental impacts (traffic, noise, lighting, air pollution, and odor) to adjacent land.</li> <li>Be adequately served by existing and planned infrastructure.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul> <li>The property is surrounded by open space and industrial land uses and will not intrude into existing residential neighborhoods or other land uses because the project will directly impact existing development and/or areas of previous disturbance.</li> <li>The project will adhere to the land use adjacency guidelines for indirect impacts adjacent to the MHPA. All potentially significant impacts to adjacent land would be mitigated.</li> <li>The project will utilize existing infrastructure and utilities.</li> </ul>			

Summary of Project Consi	Table 4.1-1           Summary of Project Consistency with Applicable Land Use Plans Goals and Objectives				
Goals	Consistency Evaluation				
Prime Industrial Land	Per General Plan Figure EP-1, the existing and proposed development area of site is				
EP-A.12. Protect Prime Industrial Land as shown	located in an area where Prime Industrial Land policies apply. The project would				
on the Industrial and Prime Industrial Land Map,	retain the Industrial Employment use of the site.				
General Plan Figure EP-1. As community plans are					
updated, the applicability of the Prime Industrial					
Land Map will be revisited and changes					
considered.					
a. Amend the boundaries of General Plan					
Figure EP-1 if community plan updates or					
community plan amendments lead to an					
addition of Prime Industrial Lands, or					
conversely, a conversion of Prime					
Industrial Land uses to other uses that					
would necessitate the removal of					
properties from the Prime Industrial Land identification.					
b. Amend the boundaries of General Plan					
Figure EP-1 if community plan updates or					
community plan amendments/rezones					
lead to a collocation (the geographic					
integration of residential uses and other					
non-industrial uses into industrial uses					
located on the same premises) of uses.					
c. Justification for a land use change must be					
supported by an evaluation of the prime					
industrial land criteria in Appendix C,					
General Plan Figure EP-1, the					
collocation/conversion suitability factors in					
Appendix C, EP-2, and the potential					
contribution of the area to the local and					
regional economy.					

Table 4.1-1 Summary of Project Consistency with Applicable Land Use Plans Goals and Objectives				
Goals	Consistency Evaluation			
EP-A.13. In areas identified as Prime Industrial	The project would not include public assembly or sensitive receptor land uses.			
Land as shown on General Plan Figure EP-1, do				
not permit discretionary use permits for public				
assembly or sensitive receptor land uses.				
EP-A.14. In areas identified as Prime Industrial	The project does not propose child care facilities.			
Land as shown on Figure EP-1, child care facilities				
for employees' children, as an ancillary use to				
industrial uses on a site, may be considered and				
allowed when they: are sited at a demonstrably				
adequate distance from the property line, so as				
not to limit the current or future operations of any				
adjacent industrially-designated property; can				
assure that health and safety requirements are				
met in compliance with required permits; and are				
not precluded by the applicable Airport Land Use				
Compatibility Plan.				
EP-A.15. The identification of Prime Industrial	The proposed research and development intensification would not conflict with this			
Land on any property does not preclude the	policy.			
development or redevelopment of such property				
pursuant to the development regulations and				
permitted uses of the existing zone and				
community plan designation, nor does it limit the				
application of any of the Industrial Employment				
recommended community plan land use				
designations in Table LU-4, provided that				
residential use is not included.				

Table 4.1-1 Summary of Project Consistency with Applicable Land Use Plans Goals and Objectives				
Goals	Consistency Evaluation			
EP-E.1. Encourage the retention and creation of	The site is located in the University/Sorrento Mesa Regional Center and Subregional			
<ul> <li>middle-income employment by:</li> <li>Preserving employment land and capacity for base sector export industries that generate opportunities for middle-income wage earners as discussed in Section A.</li> <li>Investing in infrastructure, educational and</li> </ul>	Employment Area. The project would provide 400-450 new high-paying jobs in the science industry, which is consistent with the area designation and this policy.			
<ul> <li>skill development, and quality of life assets that support middle-income employment development.</li> <li>Encouraging the development of measures that facilitate expansion of high technology business facilities that have the potential to create middle-income jobs likely to be filled by local residents.</li> <li>Supporting the creation of higher quality jobs in low-paying industries (such as</li> </ul>				
visitor, entertainment and amusement).				
B. <u>Regional and Subregional Employment Areas</u> A city where new employment growth is encouraged in the existing regional center and subregional employment areas connected by transit to minimize the economic, social, and	The project consists of an infill development within an existing employment area that is currently serviced by transit. Thus, the project is consistent with this goal.			
environmental costs of growth.				

Summary of Project Consi	Table 4.1-1 Summary of Project Consistency with Applicable Land Use Plans Goals and Objectives				
Goals Consistency Evaluation					
<ul> <li>Public Facilities, Services, and Safety Element Applicable goals: <ul> <li>C. Evaluation of Growth, Facilities and Services</li> <li>Adequate public facilities available at the time of need</li> <li>Public facilities exactions that mitigate the facilities impacts that are attributable to new development.</li> <li>Improvement of quality of life in communities through the evaluation of private development and the determinate of appropriate exactions.</li> </ul></li></ul>	Payment of required FBA fees would ensure that direct impacts to fire protection and emergency services would be less than significant. The project would provide sewer, water, and storm water improvements necessary to accommodate the project (see Section 3.2.7). The project would also include transportation mitigation improvements (see Section 4.2, mitigation measures TR-1 to TR-5).				
<ul> <li>D. <u>Fire-Rescue</u></li> <li>Protection of life, property, and environment by delivering the highest level of emergency and fire-rescue services, hazard prevention, and safety education.</li> </ul>	The project would not impair existing fire-rescue service and would not conflict with this goal.				
<ul> <li>F. <u>Wastewater</u></li> <li>Environmentally sound collection, treatment, re-use, disposal, and monitoring of wastewater.</li> </ul>	Adequate wastewater facilities are available to service the project and the project would not conflict with this goal.				
<ul> <li>G. <u>Storm Water Infrastructure</u></li> <li>Protection of beneficial water resources through pollution prevention and interception efforts.</li> </ul>	As required by regulations, the project would include construction and operational best management practices to reduce pollution in runoff.				
<ul> <li>H. <u>Waste Management</u></li> <li>Maximum diversion of materials from disposal through the reduction, reuse and recycling of wastes to the highest and best use.</li> </ul>	The project would generate large amounts of solid waste through demolition, construction, and operation. However, the project would mitigate potential impacts by reducing waste through implementation of a WMP (Appendix K) and adherence to applicable regulations, including the City's Municipal Code. The project would also reduce solid waste impacts through achieving LEED Silver certification.				

Summary of Project Consi	Table 4.1-1 stency with Applicable Land Use Plans Goals and Objectives					
Goals						
<ul> <li>M. <u>Public Utilities</u> <ul> <li>Public utilities that sufficiently meet existing and future demand with facilities and maintenance practices that are sensible, efficient and well-integrated into the natural and urban landscape.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	The project applicant would provide all necessary infrastructure and utilities required to serve the project site. In addition the project would be required to pay FBA fees as necessary to funding community-wide public services, utilities, and facilities.					
<ul> <li>Q. <u>Seismic Safety</u></li> <li>Protection of public health and safety through abated structural hazards and mitigated risks posed by seismic conditions.</li> </ul>	A geotechnical and geological fault investigation prepared by Geocon Inc. (Appendix F) found that no soil or geological conditions were found on site that would preclude the development of the project. The project would be required to implement proper engineering design and utilize standard construction practices in accordance with regulations and the Geocon report, which would avoid potential impacts from geologic hazards (see Section 8.1).					
<ul> <li>Historic Preservation Element</li> <li>Applicable goals:</li> <li>A. Identification and Preservation of Historical</li> <li>Resources <ul> <li>Identification of the historical resources of the City.</li> <li>Preservation of the City's important historical resources.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Mitigation and monitoring measures would assure that were any artifacts or remains encountered in the grading/demolition/construction/post-construction phases, such resources would be properly handled and preserved.					
<ul> <li>Recreation Element</li> <li>Applicable goals:</li> <li>B. <u>Preservation</u> <ul> <li>Preserve, protect and enhance the integrity and quality of existing parks, open space, and recreation programs citywide.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	The project consists of an infill development that would focus development within the existing development footprint and would preserve the open space on-site to the maximum extent possible. The project would not significantly affect open space lands or resource-based parks (see Section 4.3) The project would not directly impact recreational areas or indirectly impact recreational areas through increases in population.					

Table 4.1-1 Summary of Project Consistency with Applicable Land Use Plans Goals and Objectives					
Goals Consistency Evaluation					
<ul> <li>F. <u>Open Space Lands and Resource-Based Parks</u></li> <li>An open space and resource-based park system that provides for the preservation and management of natural resources, enhancement of outdoor recreation opportunities, and protection of the public health and safety.</li> <li>Preservation of the natural terrain and drainage systems of San Diego's open space lands and resource-based parks.</li> <li>A system of pedestrian, bicycle and equestrian paths linking communities, neighborhoods, parks, and the open space system.</li> </ul>	The project consists of an infill development that would focus development within the existing development footprint. The project would not significantly affect open space lands or resource-based parks. Refer to Section 4.3 for additional details. The project would not affect any trails, sidewalks, or bike lanes.				
<ul> <li>Conservation Element</li> <li>Applicable goals:</li> <li>A. <u>Climate Change and Sustainable Development</u></li> <li>To reduce the City's overall carbon dioxide footprint by improving energy efficiency, increasing use of alternative modes of transportation, employing sustainable planning and design techniques, and providing environmentally sound waste management.</li> </ul>	The project has been designed to comply with the City's Climate Change and Sustainable Development goals contained in the General Plan's Conservation Element. Project design features would serve to reduce or avoid potential effects associated with water and energy consumption, consumption of non-renewable or slowly-renewing resources, urban runoff and water quality, solid waste generation, and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. The project would be constructed in accordance with CALGreen and would achieve GHG reductions through green building design that includes improved energy efficiency and water conservation. The project is designed to achieve LEED Silver certification. The project would also include a Waste Management Plan (see Appendix K) to reduce solid waste generated by the project. Specific sustainable project design elements are discussed in further detail in Section 3.2.8. The project would also include a TDM program to increase alternative modes of transportation, as detailed in Section 3.3.5.				
<ul> <li>B. <u>Open Space and Landform Preservation</u></li> <li>Preservation and long-term management of the natural landforms and open spaces that help make San Diego unique.</li> </ul>	The project consists of an infill development that would focus development within the existing development footprint. Refer to Section 4.3 for additional details. The projects impact to landform alternation would be less than significant, as discussed in Section 8.7.				

	Table 4.1-1 Summary of Project Consistency with Applicable Land Use Plans Goals and Objectives					
	Goals Consistency Evaluation					
G.	<ul> <li><u>Biological Diversity</u></li> <li>Preservation of healthy, biologically diverse regional ecosystem and conservation of endangered, threatened, and key sensitive species and their habitats.</li> </ul>	The project would mitigate its potential impacts to sensitive species, including nesting birds (see Section 4.3.2). The project would also comply with the MSCP Land Use Adjacency Guidelines. Thus, the project would not significantly impact the regional ecosystem preservation.				
1.	<ul> <li>Sustainable Energy</li> <li>An increase in local energy independence through conservation, efficient community design, reduced consumption, and efficient production and development of energy supplies that are diverse, efficient, environmentally-sound, sustainable, and reliable.</li> </ul>	The project is pursing LEED Silver certification and would include energy efficiency measures. Energy conservation impacts of the project would be less than significant.				
J.	Urban Forestry	The project would include a landscaping plan that would increase the landscaping on-				
	• Protection and expansion of a sustainable urban forest.	site.				
No	bise Element	The project does not contain any land use types or features that would generate				
Ар	plicable goals:	excessive noise or significantly increase ambient noise. Exterior and interior noise				
A.	<ul> <li>Noise and Land Use Compatibility</li> <li>Consider existing and future noise levels when making land use planning decisions to minimize people's exposure to excessive noise.</li> </ul>	levels on-site would not exceed the limits established in the General Plan. Project- related traffic noise increases would be less than 3 dB, and would not be audible to off-site residents. All necessary and required measures would be implemented to ensure compliance, where feasible, with indoor/outdoor noise level standards and regulations. Land use impacts due to noise exposure to on- and off-site receivers would be less than significant. Refer to Sections 4.1.4 and 8.6 for additional information.				
В.	<ul> <li><u>Motor Vehicle Traffic Noise</u></li> <li>Minimal excessive motor vehicle traffic noise on residential and other noise-sensitive land uses.</li> </ul>	There are no residential or other noise-sensitive land uses in proximity to the project site, and the project would have a less than significant traffic noise impact (see Section 8.6).				

Table 4.1-1 Summary of Project Consistency with Applicable Land Use Plans Goals and Objectives				
Goals	Consistency Evaluation			
<ul> <li>D. <u>Aircraft Noise</u></li> <li>Minimal excessive aircraft-related noise on residential and other noise-sensitive land uses.</li> </ul>	The project site is outside the 60 CNEL contour of MCAS Miramar. Noise-sensitive receptors would not be exposed to excessive aircraft noise. Refer to Section 4.1.6 for additional details.			
<ul> <li>G. <u>Construction, Refuse Vehicles, Parking Lot</u> <u>Sweepers, and Public Activity Noise</u></li> <li>Minimal exposure of residential and other noise-sensitive land uses to excessive construction refuse vehicles, parking lot sweeper-related noise and public noise.</li> </ul>	The project would comply with construction time limits, as required by the City of San Diego's Noise Abatement and Control Ordinance. There are no residential or other noise-sensitive land uses in the vicinity of the proposed project. The surrounding land uses include industrial, commercial, office, open space, and undeveloped land. Refer to Section 8.6 for additional information.			

# 4.2 Transportation/Circulation

This section analyzes the impacts of project-generated traffic on the study area street system as well as freeways, interchanges, and ramps. The 1993 FEIR addressed traffic in Section 4.1. A comparison to the 1993 FEIR can be found at the end of this chapter (Section 4.2.8) and includes Table 4.2-14 which provides a summary of the direct and cumulative impacts discussed in the 1993 FEIR compared to those found in the current Transportation Impact Assessment (TIA). The discussion in Section 4.1 of the 1993 FEIR concluded the project would cause reductions in levels of service (LOS) resulting in significant and unmitigated direct impacts to the Regents Road segment south of Genesee Avenue; as well as to the Genesee Avenue intersections at Campus Point Drive, Regents Road, and Eastgate Mall. The project's impacts to Campus Point Drive were found to be mitigated through implementation of the Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program.

As shown in Table 4.2-14, the 1993 FEIR also concluded significant cumulative impacts at most of the Genesee Avenue segments analyzed as well as all of the Genesee intersections in the study area with the exception of the Genesee Avenue/La Jolla Village Drive intersection. The 1993 FEIR states that while the project would make its fair share contribution of fees toward mitigation pursuant to the University Public Facilities Financing Plan (PFFP), only the No Project Alternative or an alternative site in another community without cumulative traffic impacts would avoid the significant cumulative impacts associated with the project. Therefore, the cumulative impacts called out as significant in the table below were concluded to be significant and unmitigated.

The current proposal represents a reduction of 148,892 square feet compared to what was analyzed in the 1993 FEIR. In addition, the Genesee Avenue bridge widening project is currently under construction and other improvements have been made within the study area since the 1993 FEIR was prepared. Therefore, in order to update the traffic conditions, a TIA dated September 21, 2016 was prepared by Urban Systems Associates Inc. and is attached to this SEIR as Appendix C. The TIA analyzes project impacts for the Existing, Near-term (2017), and Horizon Year 2035 (long-term) scenarios. The analysis is provided herein. As shown in Table 4.2-14, the proposed project would have fewer direct and cumulative impacts compared to those discussed in the 1993 FEIR.

# 4.2.1 Existing Conditions

## 4.2.1.1 Level of Service Standards

LOS is a professional industry standard by which to measure the operating conditions of a given roadway segment or intersection. LOS is defined on a scale of A to F, where LOS A through C represents free-flowing traffic conditions with little or no delay. LOS D represents limited congestion and some delay; however, the duration of periods of delay is acceptable to most people. LOS E and F

represent significant delay on local streets, which are generally unacceptable for design purposes (see Appendix C).

#### a. Street Segment LOS

The City has developed LOS threshold tables based on the different functional street classifications and their ability to carry traffic. For the City, LOS D is the acceptable LOS standard for street segments.

#### **b.** Intersection LOS

The City evaluates intersection LOS based on average control delay expressed in seconds. A computer program is used to complete the analysis and it takes into account traffic volumes and intersection movements. As with street segments, the City has established LOS D or better as the goal for intersections.

#### c. California Department of Transportation Freeway Segment LOS

For freeway main lane segments, the City uses the procedure used by District 11 of the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), which calculates LOS as a ratio of lane capacity per hour to volume per hour. This method focuses on the AM and PM peak hour for determining LOS rather than the 24-hour tables developed for circulation element roads. According to the City's standards, the allowable increase in volume-to-capacity ratio for freeway segments is 0.01 at LOS E or 0.005 at LOS F. Hourly capacity for freeway segments is based on data contained in Guide for Preparation of Traffic Impact Studies (Caltrans 2002). Also discussed in that guide are appropriate mitigation measures for freeway segments and interchanges.

Metered freeway on-ramp analysis is based on the mainline operation and the delay at the ramp meter. For a ramp meter to be considered operating at unacceptable levels the mainline must be operating at unacceptable LOS E or F and the delay at the ramp meter must exceed 15 minutes. For the project impact to the ramp meter to be significant, the project must cause an increase in delay of 1.0 minute where mainline operations are LOS F, or an increase in delay of 2.0 minutes where mainline operations are LOS E. The ramp meter analysis is based on the most restrictive meter rate provided by Caltrans.

### 4.2.1.2 Existing Circulation System

Figure 4.2-1 shows the study area street segments and intersections in the project area. Brief descriptions of the area's roadways are provided below.

**Genesee Avenue.** This north-south roadway is built out to its functional classification of six-lane Prime Arterial from Interstate 5 (I-5) northbound (NB) ramps to Regents Road and six-lane Major Arterial from Regents Road to La Jolla Village Drive. The roadway includes a raised median and onstreet parking is prohibited. The speed limit ranges from 40 miles per hour (mph) south of Regents Road to 50 mph near the I-5 Interchange. Class II bike lanes exist on Genesee Avenue between I-5 and La Jolla Village Drive.



**Campus Point Drive.** This north-south roadway has a functional classification of three-lane Collector (one NB lane and two southbound [SB] lanes) with a two-way/center left-turn lane. North of Campus Point Court, the road narrows to a two-lane Collector road with a two-way, left-turn lane. Campus Point Drive is approximately 64 feet wide curb-to-curb just north of Genesee Avenue and narrows past Campus Point Court to 45 feet curb-to-curb. The University Community Plan (UCP) identifies the ultimate classification for this roadway as a four-lane Collector. Campus Point Drive has parking on both sides and no bike lane. The speed limit is 35 mph. A cul-de-sac currently exists at the north end of Campus Point drive where the public street terminates. Further north, a driveway provides access to the project site.

### 4.2.1.3 Existing Traffic Volumes

#### a. Street Segments

Figure 4.2-2 shows existing average weekday volumes (average daily traffic [ADT]) on street segments within the study area. These volumes were taken from traffic counts conducted in September 2012. Table 4.2-1 summarizes the existing street segment LOS. As shown, all segments in the study area operate at acceptable levels except Genesee Avenue between the I-5 SB and NB ramps, which would operate at LOS E.

Table 4.2-1 Existing Street Segment Levels of Service						
Road	Segment	Class	Cap.	Volume	V/C	LOS
	I-5 SB Ramps to I-5 NB Ramps	4-M	40,000	39,850	1.00	E
	I-5 NB Ramps to Scripps Hospital	6-PA	60,000	38,814	0.65	С
	Scripps Hospital to Campus Point Dr.	6-PA	60,000	33,993	0.57	В
Genesee Ave.	Campus Point Dr. to Regents Rd.	6-PA	60,000	30,602	0.51	В
	Regents Rd. to Eastgate Mall	6-M	50,000	28,038	0.56	С
	Eastgate Mall to Executive Dr.	6-M	50,000	25,884	0.52	В
	Executive Dr. to La Jolla Village Dr.	6-M	50,000	26,998	0.54	В
Campus Daint	Genesee Ave. to Campus Point	3-C	22,500	11,117	0.49	С
Campus Point Dr.	Court					
DI.	North of Campus Point Court	2-Ca	15,000	5,388	0.36	В
SOURCE: Appendi	x C.					
Count Date: Septe	ember 2012.					
BOLD = Unaccept	able LOS					
All roadways are v	within the jurisdiction of the City of San	Diego.				
Class = Functiona	Class					
Cap.= Capacity						
V/C = Volume to C	apacity Ratio					
LOS = Level of Ser	vice					
PA = 6-Lane Prime	e Arterial					
6-M = 6-Lane Maje	or Arterial					
4-M = 4-Lane Maje	or Arterial					
	ector with two-way left turn lane					
3-C = 3-lane Colle	ctor with two-way left-turn lane					



#### **b.** Intersections

Table 4.2-2 shows the existing AM and PM peak hour intersection traffic data, which was collected at the intersections in September 2012. As shown, all intersections currently operate at LOS D or better during the AM and PM peak hour periods except for the intersection of Genesee Avenue/I-5 SB ramp, which operates at LOS F during the PM peak hour, and Genesee Avenue/La Jolla Village Drive, which operates at LOS E during the AM peak hour.

Table 4.2-2 Existing Intersection Levels of Service						
	AM Peak Hour PM Peak				k Hour	
No.	Intersection	Control	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS
1	Genesee Ave./I-5 Southbound Ramps	Signalized	33.9	С	109.4	F
2	Genesee Ave./I-5 Northbound Ramps	Signalized	24.4	С	23.2	С
3	Genesee Ave./Scripps Hospital Driveway	Signalized	15.8	В	19.3	В
4	Genesee Ave./Campus Point Dr.	Signalized	41.0	D	45.2	D
5	Genesee Ave./Regents Road	Signalized	24.3	С	13.6	В
6	Genesee Ave./Eastgate Mall	Signalized	35.5	D	37.2	D
7	Genesee Ave./Executive Dr.	Signalized	19.6	В	31.9	С
8	Genesee Ave./La Jolla Village Dr.	Signalized	70.1	E	48.0	D
9	Campus Point Dr./Campus Point Ct.	Unsignalized	14.6	В	11.9	В
SOURCE: Appendix C.						
BOLD = Unacceptable LOS						
LOS = Level of Service						
Delay is measured in seconds per vehicle						

#### c. Freeway Segments

The freeway analysis includes two segments of the I-5: La Jolla Village Drive to Genesee Avenue, and north of Genesee Avenue. Under the existing conditions, both of these segments operate at acceptable LOS D or better (Table 4.2-3). It is noted that there are no existing ramp meters at the I-5/Genesee Avenue interchange; thus, no metered freeway on-ramp analysis is completed for the existing condition.

Table 4.2-3 Existing Freeway Segment Levels of Service												
I-5 Segment     Lanes     Dir.     Cap     ADT     Hr.     Split     PHV     V/C												
La Jolla Village Dr. to	4	NB	9,400	158,000	0.081	0.56	7,078	0.753	С			
Genesee Ave.	4	SB	9,400	158,000	0.078	0.55	6,810	0.724	С			
North of Genesee Ave.	6	NB	12,760	164,000	0.081	0.56	7,347	0.576	В			
5 SB 11,080 1					0.078	0.55	7,069	0.638	С			
5SB11,080164,0000.0780.557,0690.638CSOURCE: Appendix C.Dir. = DirectionCap. = CapacityADT = Average Daily TrafficPHV = Peak Hour VolumeV/C = Volume to Capacity RatioLOS = Level of Service												

## 4.2.2 Significance Determination Thresholds

Based on the City's 2011 Significance Determination Thresholds, impacts related to traffic circulation would be significant if the project would:

- 1. Result in an increase in projected traffic, which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system or planned transportation system (Table 4.2-4);
- 2. Result in a substantial impact upon existing or planned transportation systems;
- 3. Result in traffic generation in excess of specific community plan allocation;
- 4. Result in the addition of a substantial amount of traffic to a congested freeway segment, interchange, or ramp;
- 5. Result in substantial alteration to present circulation movements, including effects on existing public access to beaches, parks or other open space areas;
- 6. Result in an increase in traffic hazards for motor vehicles, bicyclists or pedestrians due to proposed non-standard design feature (e.g., poor sight distance or driveway onto an access-restricted roadway); and/or
- 7. Result in a conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation models (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks).

Direct and cumulative impacts related to traffic circulation would be significant if:

- Any intersection, roadway segment, or freeway segment affected by a project would operate at LOS E or F under either direct or cumulative conditions, the impact would be significant if the project exceeds the thresholds shown in Table 4.2-4, or if the project would cause intersection or segment LOS to degrade from acceptable to unacceptable.
- At any ramp meter location with delays above 15 minutes, the impact would be significant if the project exceeds the thresholds shown in Table 4.2-4.
- A project would increase traffic hazards to motor vehicles, bicyclists, or pedestrians due to proposed non-standard design features (e.g., poor sight distance, proposed driveway onto an access-restricted roadway).
- A project would result in the construction of a roadway which is inconsistent with the General Plan and/or a community plan, and would not properly align with other existing or planned roadways.
- A project would result in a substantial restriction in access to publicly or privately owned land.

Table 4.2-4 Significance Thresholds														
	Allowable Change Due to Project Impact*													
			Roa	adway		Ramp								
	Free	ways	Seg	ments	Intersections	Metering								
		Speed		Speed	Delay	Delay								
LOS with Project <sup>†</sup>	V/C (mph)		V/C	(mph)	(seconds)	(minutes)								
E (or ramp meter delays above 15 minutes)	0.010	1.0	0.02	1.0	2.0	2.0								
F (or ramp meter delays above 15 minutes)	0.005	0.5	0.01	0.5	1.0	1.0								
SOURCE: Appendix C; City of San Diego 1998a. V/C = Volume to Capacity Ratio *The allowable increase in delay at a ramp meter with more than 15 minutes delay and														
freeway LOS F is 1 minute <sup>†</sup> The allowable increase in freeway LOS E is 2 minute	delay at a	ramp me	ter with r	more than <sup>-</sup>	15 minutes delay	/ and								

## 4.2.3 Issues 1 and 2: Traffic Capacity

Would the project result in an increase in projected traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system?

Would the project result in a substantial impact upon existing or planned transportation systems?

### 4.2.3.1 Impacts

Pursuant to the thresholds described above, the definitions of direct and cumulative impacts are summarized below.

*Direct traffic impacts* are those projected to occur under "existing + project" conditions and in the near-term at the time a proposed development becomes operational. The calculations include other operating projects and those not yet operational, but which are anticipated to be operational when the project goes into effect.

*Cumulative traffic impacts* are those projected to occur in the long-term after a proposed development becomes operational, such as when affected community plan areas reach full planned buildout (long-term cumulative).

### a. Project Traffic Generation

Trip generation is the vehicular traffic increase due to development of a specific land use. Vehicular traffic generation characteristics for the project were estimated based on rates in the City's *Trip Generation Manual*, dated May 2003. Table 4.2-5 provides the trip generation for both the existing uses (to remain) which include CP1 and CP2, and the proposed uses which include CP3 and CP4. As shown, the project would net an additional 2,555 ADT with 410 AM (369 in, 41 out)/359 PM (36 in, 323 out) peak hour trips. Figure 4.2-3 shows the distribution of project traffic.

#### **b.** Direct Impacts

#### Existing with Project

The Existing Plus Project analysis is based on the existing intersection and roadway conditions, with addition of the traffic generated by the project to the existing traffic volumes. Figure 4.2-4 illustrates the Existing with Project ADT.

#### Street Segments

As shown in Table 4.2-1, all segments in the study area currently operate at acceptable levels except Genesee Avenue between the I-5 SB and NB ramps, which operate at LOS E. With the addition of project traffic to the existing conditions, all street segments would continue to operate at acceptable levels except the following segment (Table 4.2-6):

• Genesee Avenue between the I-5 SB and NB ramps (LOS F).

#### Intersections

As shown in Table 4.2-2 above, all intersections operate at acceptable levels in the existing conditions except Genesee Avenue at the I-5 SB ramp (LOS F in the PM peak hour) and Genesee Avenue at La Jolla Village Drive (LOS E in AM peak hour). Under the Existing with Project condition, the following intersections would operate at unacceptable levels (Table 4.2-7):

- Genesee Avenue/I-5 SB Ramps (LOS F in the PM peak hour)
- Genesee Avenue/La Jolla Village Drive (LOS E in the AM peak hour)
- Campus Point Drive/Campus Point Court (LOS E in the AM peak hour).

With the completion of the project, the Genesee Avenue/I-5 SB ramps intersection mentioned above would continue to operate unacceptably and, in addition, the Campus Point Drive/Campus Point Court intersection would operate unacceptably. However, the Genesee Avenue/La Jolla Village Drive intersection would not be considered significant because the project would not increase the delay by more than 2 seconds. Thus, the intersections operating unacceptably under the Existing with Project conditions would consist of the following intersections (see Table 4.2-7):

- Genesee Avenue/I-5 SB Ramps (LOS F in the PM peak hour),
- Campus Point Drive/Campus Point Court (LOS E in the AM peak hour).

			Tab	le 4.	2-5										
			Project	Trip	Traff	С									
			AM	l Peak	Hour		PM Peak Hour								
Use	Square footage	Generation Rate <sup>1</sup>	ADT	%	#	In	Out	In	Out	%	#	In	Out	In	Out
Existing															
Scientific Research (CP1)	463,791	8/KSF	3,710	16	594	9	1	535	59	14	519	1	9	52	467
Scientific Research (CP2)	267,934	8/KSF	2,143	16	343	9	1	309	34	14	300	1	9	30	270
Proposed															
Scientific Research (CP3)	318,383	8/KSF	2,547	16	408	9	1	367	41	14	357	1	9	36	321
Manufacturing (CP4)	2,000	4/KSF	8	20	2	9	1	2	0	20	2	2	8	0	2
Amenity Space (CP4) <sup>2</sup>	8,000														
Total Proposed Net Increase		-	2,555		410			369	41		359			36	323
SOURCE: Appendix C.															
1Trip Generation Rate from Cit	y of San Di	egoTrip Gener	ation Mar	nual (	May 20	)03)									
2Amenity space primarily inter	nded to serv	ve patrons on-	site and r	not be	e expe	ted t	to gene	erate e	xterna	I ADT					
ADT = average daily traffic															
% = percentage															
# = number of trips															
KSF= thousand square feet															





FIGURE 4.2-4 Existing Plus Project Average Daily Traffic

	Evisting	and Existin		le 4.2-6	eet Segme	nt Compa	rison —				
	Existing and Existing with Project Street Segment Comparison         Existing       Existing         Existing       Existing + Project										Significan
					Ī					-	t
Road	Segment	Capacity	Class	LOS	Volume	V/C	LOS	Volume	V/C	$\Delta$ V/C	Impact?
	I-5 SB Ramps to I-5 NB Ramps	40,000	4-M	E	39,850	1.00	F	40,591	1.01	0.019	Yes
	I-5 NB Ramps to Scripps Hospital	60,000	6-PA	С	38,814	0.65	С	39,785	0.66	0.016	No
	Scripps Hospital to Campus Point Dr.	60,000	6-PA	В	33,993	0.57	В	34,989	0.58	0.017	No
Genesee Ave.	Campus Point Dr. to Regents Rd.	60,000	6-PA	В	30,602	0.51	В	31,803	0.53	0.020	No
	Regents Rd. to Eastgate Mall	50,000	6-M	С	28,038	0.56	С	28,983	0.58	0.019	No
	Eastgate Mall to Executive Dr.	50,000	6-M	В	25,884	0.52	В	26,574	0.53	0.014	No
	Executive Dr. to La Jolla Village Dr.	50,000	6-M	В	26,998	0.54	В	27,432	0.55	0.009	No
Campus Point	Genesee Ave. to Campus Point Court	22,500	3-C	С	11,117	0.49	С	13,570	0.60	0.109	No
Dr.	North of Campus Point Court	15,000	2-Ca	В	5,388	0.36	C	7,943	0.53	0.170	No
SOURCE: Appen											
BOLD = Unacce	ptable LOS										
Class = Function	al Class										
PA = 6-Lane Prir											
6-M = 6-Lane Ma	5										
4-M = 4-Lane Ma	-										
	llector with two-way left turn lane										
	lector with two-way left-turn lane										
LOS = Level of S											
V/C = Volume to	1 5										
$\Delta$ V/C = Change	in V/C ratio										

				Та	ble 4.2	-7							
		Existing	and Exi	sting with	n Projec	t Interse	ection Su	ummary					
			Exis	sting		Existing + Project							
		AM Pea			AM Pea	ak Hour			PM Peak Hour				
No.	Intersection	Delay LOS Delay LOS Delay		Delay	LOS	Δ	Sig?	Delay	LOS	Δ	Sig?		
1	Genesee Ave./I-5 Southbound Ramps	33.9	С	109.4	F	39.6	D	5.7	No	119.2	F	9.8	Yes
2	Genesee Ave./I-5 Northbound Ramps	24.4	С	23.2	С	25.9	С	1.5	No	45.9	D	22.7	No
3	Genesee Ave./Scripps Hospital Driveway	15.8	В	19.3	В	15.9	В	0.1	No	19.3	В	0.0	No
4	Genesee Ave./Campus Point Dr.	41.0	D	45.2	D	45.8	D	4.8	No	49.6	D	4.4	No
5	Genesee Ave./Regents Road	24.3	С	13.6	В	24.4	С	0.1	No	14.1	В	0.5	No
6	Genesee Ave./Eastgate Mall	35.5	D	37.2	D	37.3	D	2.2	No	38.2	D	1.0	No
7	Genesee Ave./Executive Dr.	19.6	В	31.9	C	20.0	С	0.4	No	32.9	C	1.0	No
8	Genesee Ave./La Jolla Village Dr.	70.1	Е	48.0	D	70.4	Е	0.3	No	49.3	D	1.3	No
9	Campus Point Dr./Campus Point Ct.*	14.6	В	11.9	E	37.7	Е	23.1	Yes	23.2	C	11.3	No
SOUI	RCE: Appendix C.												
BOLI	<b>D</b> = Unacceptable LOS $\Delta$												
LOS :	= Level of Service												
	Change in LOS												
Sig? =	= Significant?												
*Uns	ignalized												
### Near-term without Project

The Near-term analysis represents the expected traffic conditions for the Year 2017 when the project is anticipated to be operational. The Near-term without Project condition adds the traffic volumes of 14 other projects proposed (listed below) in the area to the existing conditions (2012) traffic volumes, as applicable. It is noted that not all of these cumulative projects would add significant amounts of traffic to the study area and that some of these projects may not be fully operational at the time the project is operational.

- 1. Scripps Memorial Hospital, La Jolla Master Plan increase of 411,729 square feet of medical office and increase of 142 beds (10,995 ADT)
- 2. La Jolla Commons 325-room hotel, 162,000 square feet of office, and 106,000 square feet of research and development/office (10,319 ADT)
- 3. Nexus Center 67,000 square feet of research and development/office (1,915 ADT)
- 4. Scripps Green Hospital 39,024 square feet of hospital, 125,000 square feet of cancer treatment facility (780 ADT)
- 5. Salk Institute 239,182 square feet of science complex (1,788 ADT)
- 6. Genesee Executive Plaza 22,500 square feet of medical office conversion (788 ADT)
- 7. University City Village 464 DU retirement housing (1,856 ADT)
- 8. UCSD East Campus Bed Tower 245 beds medical facility (4,900 ADT)
- 9. Coast Income Properties 51,086 square feet of research and development/ office (1,688 ADT)
- 10. UTC Revitalization Project 750,000 square feet of regional retail / 250 multi-family DU (21,900 ADT)
- 11. La Jolla Centre III 340,000 square feet of commercial office (4,162 ADT)
- 12. Monte Verde 560 DU (3,360 ADT)
- 13. Torrey Pines City Park Expansion (Glider Port) 5 acres of City park (180 ADT)
- 14. 9455 Towne Center Drive 150,000 square feet of research and development/office (1,934 ADT)

#### Street Segments

As shown in Table 4.2-8, all street segments are projected to operate at acceptable levels of service in the Near-term condition without project except:

• Genesee Avenue between the I-5 SB and NB ramps (LOS F).

#### Intersections

As shown in Table 4.2-9, Genesee Avenue at La Jolla Village Drive is expected to operate at an unacceptable LOS E in the AM peak hour and Genesee Avenue at the I-5 SB ramps would operate at LOS E in the PM peak hour.

			Tab	le 4.2-8							
	Near-term	and Near-te	erm with F	Project	Street Segr	ment Com	parison				
				Near-term		m	Ne	Near-term + Project			Significant
Road	Segment	Capacity	Class	LOS	Volume	V/C	LOS	Volume	V/C	$\Delta$ V/C	Impact?
	I-5 SB Ramps to I-5 NB Ramps	40,000	4-M	F	44,758	1.12	F	45,499	1.14	0.019	Yes
	I-5 NB Ramps to Scripps Hospital	60,000	6-PA	С	45,084	0.75	С	46,055	0.77	0.016	No
	Scripps Hospital to Campus Point Dr.	60,000	6-PA	С	40,386	0.67	С	41,382	0.69	0.017	No
Genesee Ave.	Campus Point Dr. to Regents Rd.	60,000	6-PA	С	37,608	0.63	С	38,809	0.65	0.020	No
	Regents Rd. to Eastgate Mall	50,000	6-M	С	33,218	0.66	С	34,163	0.68	0.019	No
	Eastgate Mall to Executive Dr.	50,000	6-M	С	30,946	0.62	С	31,636	0.63	0.014	No
	Executive Dr. to La Jolla Village Dr.	50,000	6-M	С	31,791	0.64	С	32,225	0.64	0.009	No
Commune Dalinst Du	Genesee Ave. to Campus Point Court	22,500	3-C	С	11,148	0.50	С	13,601	0.60	0.109	No
Campus Point Dr.	North of Campus Point Court	15,000	2-Ca	С	5,419	0.36	С	7,974	0.53	0.170	No
SOURCE: Appendix	x C.										
BOLD = Unaccepta	able LOS										
Class = Functional	Class										
PA = 6-Lane Prime	Arterial										
6-M = 6-Lane Majo											
4-M = 4-Lane Majo											
	ector with two-way left turn lane										
	tor with two-way left-turn lane										
LOS = Level of Serv											
V/C = Volume to Ca											
$\Delta$ V/C = Change in	V/C ratio										

				Та	ble 4.2	-9										
	Νε	ar-term	and Nea	ar-term w	vith Pro	oject Inte	rsectior	n Summa	ary							
			Near	-term				-	Near-term	with Projec	with Project					
		AM Pea	ak Hour	PM Peal	< Hour	AM Pea	ak Hour			PM Peak Hour						
No.	Intersection	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Δ	Sig?	Delay	LOS	Δ	Sig?			
1	Genesee Ave./I-5 Southbound Ramps	50.6	D	69.7	E	58.1	Е	7.5	Yes	73.4	E	3.7	Yes			
2	Genesee Ave./I-5 Northbound Ramps	35.5	D	44.2	D	40.1	D	4.6	No	48.3	D	4.1	No			
3	Genesee Ave./Scripps Hospital Driveway	23.1	С	23.5	С	23.5	С	0.4	No	24.0	С	0.5	No			
4	Genesee Ave./Campus Point Dr.	49.3	D	47.0	D	53.8	D	4.5	No	53.4	D	6.4	No			
5	Genesee Ave./Regents Road	15.5	В	12.1	В	16.1	В	0.6	No	12.3	В	0.2	No			
6	Genesee Ave./Eastgate Mall	42.1	D	40.1	D	42.1	D	0.0	No	42.3	D	2.2	No			
7	Genesee Ave./Executive Dr.	26.6	С	30.1	С	27.2	С	0.6	No	35.1	D	5.0	No			
8	Genesee Ave./La Jolla Village Dr.	78.8	Е	46.1	D	80.1	F	1.3	Yes	46.7	D	0.6	No			
9	Campus Point Dr./Campus Point Ct.*	14.6	В	11.9	В	37.7	Е	23.1	Yes	23.2	С	11.3	No			
SOU	RCE: Appendix C.															
BOL	<b>D</b> = Unacceptable LOS $\Delta$															
LOS :	= Level of Service															
$\Delta = 0$	Change in LOS															
Sig? =	= Significant?															
*Uns	ignalized															

#### Near-term with Project

The Near-term with Project analysis adds the traffic generated by the project to those Near-term conditions. Figure 4.2-5 illustrates the Near-term with Project ADT.

#### Street Segments

Under the Near-term with Project conditions, all segments would operate acceptably except the following street segment (see Table 4.2-8):

• Genesee Avenue between the I-5 SB and NB ramps (LOS F).

#### Intersections

In the Near-term without Project condition, all intersections would operate at acceptable levels except (see Table 4.2-9):

- Genesee Avenue/I-5 SB ramps (LOS E in the PM peak hour) and
- Genesee Avenue/La Jolla Village Drive (LOS E in the AM peak hour).

With the project, one additional intersection (Campus Point Drive/Campus Point Court) would operate unacceptably. Thus, under the Near-term with Project, the following three intersections would operate unacceptably (see Table 4.2-9):

- Genesee Avenue/I-5 SB ramps (LOS E in the AM and PM peak hours),
- Genesee Avenue/La Jolla Village Drive (LOS F in the AM peak hour), and
- Campus Point Drive/Campus Point Court (LOS F in the AM peak hour).

### c. Cumulative - Horizon Year (Year 2035)

The San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) Series 11, Year 2030 regional traffic forecast model is based on planning efforts involving all jurisdictions within the County of San Diego as well as the regional transportation plan. The road network changes for this scenario include the I-5/Genesee Avenue bridge interchange improvements (which is fully funded and expected to be in place by fall 2017), and the future widening of I-5 based on the I-5 North Coast Corridor analysis. Figure 4.2-6 illustrates the Horizon Year with Project average daily traffic.

#### Street Segments

As shown in Table 4.2-10, all analyzed segments are projected to operate at an acceptable LOS in the Horizon Year without Project condition except:

• Campus Point Drive between Genesee Avenue and Campus Point Court (LOS E).

Under the Horizon Year with Project condition, the following street segment would continue to operate at an unacceptable level (see Table 4.2-10):

• Campus Point Drive between Genesee Avenue and Campus Point Court (LOS F).



Not to Scale

FIGURE 4.2-5 Near-term Plus Project Average Daily Traffic



Not to Scale

				le 4.2-10							
	Horizon Year 2035	5 and Horizo	on Year 20	35 with	Project Str	eet Segme	ent Comp	arison			
				Horizon Year			Horizon Year + Project				Significant
Road	Segment	Capacity	Class	LOS	Volume	V/C	LOS	Volume	V/C	$\Delta$ V/C	Impact?
	I-5 SB Ramps to I-5 NB Ramps	60,000	6-PA	D	53,800	0.90	D	54,541	0.91	0.012	No
	I-5 NB Ramps to Scripps Hospital	60,000	6-PA	D	53,228	0.89	D	54,199	0.90	0.016	No
	Scripps Hospital to Campus Point Dr.	60,000	6-PA	С	42,900	0.72	С	43,896	0.73	0.017	No
Genesee Ave.	Campus Point Dr. to Regents Rd.	60,000	6-PA	С	43,400	0.72	C	44,601	0.74	0.020	No
	Regents Rd. to Eastgate Mall	50,000	6-M	С	37,700	0.75	С	38,645	0.77	0.019	No
	Eastgate Mall to Executive Dr.	50,000	6-M	С	33,299	0.67	С	33,989	0.68	0.014	No
	Executive Dr. to La Jolla Village Dr.	50,000	6-M	С	38,079	0.76	С	38,513	0.77	0.009	No
<b>Campus Point</b>	Genesee Ave. to Campus Point Court	22,500	3-C	E	21,300	0.95	F	23,753	1.06	0.109	Yes
Dr.	North of Campus Point Court	15,000	2-Ca	В	6,000	0.40	С	8,555	0.170	0.170	No
SOURCE: Appen	ndix C.										
BOLD = Unacce	•										
Class = Functior	nal Class										
PA = 6-Lane Prir	me Arterial										
6-M = 6-Lane M	ajor Arterial										
4-M = 4-Lane M	ajor Arterial										
2-Ca = 2-lane Co	ollector with two-way left turn lane										
3-C = 3-lane Col	lector with two-way left-turn lane										
LOS = Level of S	ervice										
V/C = Volume to	o Capacity Ratio										
$\Delta$ V/C = Change	in V/C ratio										

#### Intersections

Table 4.2-11 shows the Year 2035 with and without Project intersection LOS operations. As shown, the following three intersections are projected to operate at unacceptable levels of service without the project in the Horizon Year:

- Genesee Avenue/I-5 SB Ramps (LOS E in the AM peak hour)
- Genesee Avenue/La Jolla Village Drive (LOS F in the AM peak hour and LOS E in the PM), and
- Campus Point Drive/Campus Point Court (LOS F PM peak hour).

Under the Horizon Year with Project condition, only the following two intersections would operate at unacceptable levels due to the project (see Table 4.2-11):

- Genesee Avenue/La Jolla Village Drive (LOS F in the AM peak hour and LOS E in the PM), and
- Campus Point Drive/Campus Point Court (LOS F in both the AM and PM peak hours).

The Genesee Avenue/I-5 SB ramp (LOS E in the AM peak hour) would not be considered a significant impact as a result of the project because the increase in delay at the intersection is projected to be less than 2 seconds.

## 4.2.3.2 Significance of Impacts

### a. Direct Impacts

#### Street Segments

#### Existing with Project Condition

With the addition of project traffic to the existing conditions, the project would have a significant direct impact on the following segment (see Table 4.2-6):

• Genesee Avenue between the I-5 SB and NB ramps (LOS F).

#### Near-term Condition

Under the Near-term with Project condition, the project would have a significant direct impact on the following segment (see Table 4.2-8):

• Genesee Avenue, between the I-5 SB and NB ramps.

The I-5/Genesee Avenue Interchange Project is fully funded and under construction with an expected completion in 2017. The impact to Genesee Avenue between I-5 SB and NB ramps is a temporary (unmitigated) impact that would occur between occupancy and the completion of the widening improvements. Refer to Section 4.2.3.4 for additional information.

	Table 4.2-11												
	Horizon Year 2035 and Horizon Year 2035 with Project Intersection Comparison												
			Year 2035				Year 2035 + Project						
		AM Peak Hour PM Peak Hour		AM Pea	ak Hour			PM Peak Hour		_			
No.	Intersection	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Δ	Sig?	Delay	LOS	Δ	Sig?
1	Genesee Ave./I-5 Southbound Ramps	59.1	Е	29.6	С	59.6	Е	0.5	No	31.4	С	1.8	No
2	Genesee Ave./I-5 Northbound Ramps	37.9	D	45.5	D	38.8	D	0.9	No	50.0	D	4.5	No
3	Genesee Ave./Scripps Hospital Driveway	19.6	В	21.6	С	22.9	С	3.3	No	25.3	С	3.7	No
4	Genesee Ave./Campus Point Dr.	42.6	D	47.9	D	53.7	D	11.1	No	54.4	D	6.5	No
5	Genesee Ave./Regents Road	16.9	В	13.4	В	19.4	В	2.5	No	14.1	В	0.7	No
6	Genesee Ave./Eastgate Mall	48.2	D	44.5	D	49.0	D	0.8	No	45.5	D	1.0	No
7	Genesee Ave./Executive Dr.	27.0	С	32.7	С	27.8	С	0.8	No	33.6	С	0.9	No
8	Genesee Ave./La Jolla Village Dr.	99.1	F	57.3	Е	100.7	F	1.6	Yes	58.8	E	1.5	No
9	Campus Point Dr./Campus Point Ct.*	17.1	С	101.5	F	104.8	F	87.7	Yes	189.8	F	88.3	Yes
SOUR	CE: Appendix C.												
BOLD	= Unacceptable LOS $\Delta$												
LOS =	Level of Service												
$\Delta = Ch$	nange in LOS												
Sig? =	Significant?												
*Unsig	gnalized												

### Intersections

#### Existing with Project Condition

With the addition of the project to the existing traffic, the following significant direct intersection impacts would occur:

- Genesee Avenue/ I-5 SB ramp (PM peak hour),
- Campus Point Drive/Campus Point Court (AM peak hour).

Since Caltrans has planned improvements at Genesee Avenue/I-5 SB ramp scheduled to be completed in 2017, the Genesee Avenue/I-5 SB ramp impact would be a temporary impact that would occur between occupancy and the completion of widening improvements in fall 2017. Refer to Section 4.2.3.4 for additional information.

#### Near-term Condition

As the project would add over a 2-second delay at the intersection operating at LOS E and over a 1-second delay at the intersections operating at LOS F, the following significant direct intersection impacts would occur in the Near-term with Project condition:

- Genesee Avenue/ I-5 SB ramp (AM/PM peak hours),
- Genesee Avenue/La Jolla Village Drive (AM peak hour), and
- Campus Point Drive/Campus Point Court (AM peak hour).

The I-5/Genesee Avenue Interchange Project is fully funded and under construction with an expected completion in 2017. The impact to Genesee Avenue/I-5 SB ramp is a temporary (unmitigated) impact that would occur between occupancy and the completion of the improvements. The University Town Center Revitalization Project has fully funded the widening of Genesee Avenue approaching La Jolla Village Drive and will implement a dedicated right turn lane with construction to begin early 2017. The project's impact to the Genesee Avenue/La Jolla Village Drive intersection is a temporary unmitigated impact until the improvements are completed. Refer to Section 4.2.3.4 for additional information.

# b. Cumulative - Horizon Year (Year 2035) Impacts

### Street Segments

With the addition of the project to the Horizon Year traffic, a significant cumulative impact would occur at the following segment (see Table 4.2-10):

• Campus Point Drive between Genesee Avenue and Campus Point Court.

### Intersections

With the addition of the project to the Horizon Year, significant cumulative impacts would occur at the following intersections (see Table 4.2-11):

- Genesee Avenue/La Jolla Village Drive (LOS F; AM peak hour).
- Campus Point Drive/Campus Point Court (LOS F; AM and PM peak hours); and

### c. Summary of Impacts

In summary, the implementation of the project would result in the following significant impacts:

- Impact TR-1 (direct temporary): Genesee Avenue between the I-5 SB and NB ramps
- Impact TR-2 (cumulative): Campus Point Drive between Genesee Avenue and Campus Point Court
- Impact TR-3 (direct temporary): Genesee Avenue/I-5 SB Ramp
- Impact TR-4 (direct temporary; cumulative temporary): Genesee Avenue/La Jolla Village Drive
- Impact TR-5 (direct and cumulative): Campus Point Drive/Campus Point Court

# 4.2.3.3 Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting

### a. Street Segments

### Impact TR-1: Genesee Avenue between the I-5 SB and NB ramps

The significant direct project impact TR-1 occurs at project buildout on Genesee Avenue between the I-5 SB ramps and I-5 NB ramps. This is because the bridge segment currently operates as a fourlane Major and is operating at unacceptable LOS E today. The City and Caltrans are currently widening the bridge to six lanes which would have a LOS E capacity of 60,000 ADT. The I-5/Genesee Avenue Interchange Project is fully funded and construction is anticipated to be completed by fall of 2017. However, project impact TR-1 would remain temporarily significant and unmitigated until the Caltrans improvements are completed.

### Impact TR-2: Campus Point Drive between Genesee Avenue and Campus Point Court

Cumulative significant project impact TR-2 occurs on Campus Point Drive between Genesee Avenue and Campus Point Court. This three-lane segment with two-way left-turn lane would operate at an unacceptable LOS F with the proposed project in the Horizon Year. Therefore, the project would implement the following mitigation:

TR-2: The applicant shall provide a 19.41 percent fair-share towards the removal of parking on the east side of Campus Point Drive and restriping to include an additional northbound lane. The estimated number of on-street parking spaces to be removed on the east side is approximately 63 spaces. The 63 on-street parking spaces were determined by taking the

parking currently allowed (1,575 feet) on the east side of Campus Point Drive and dividing by the approximate length of a parking space (25 feet), thus 1,575/25 is equal to up to 63 spaces. With the addition of a northbound through lane, Campus Point Drive would become a four-lane Collector with a LOS E capacity of 30,000 ADT, which is the ultimate classification for the UCP.

### **b.** Intersections

### Impact TR-3: Genesee Avenue/I-5 SB Ramp

The significant direct project impact TR-3 occurs at project buildout at the Genesee Avenue/I-5 SB ramp. The City and Caltrans are currently widening the bridge to six lanes which would have a LOS E capacity of 60,000 ADT. The I-5/Genesee Avenue interchange (where the TR-3 impact occurs) will be modified when the proposed bridge over I-5 is widened. The improvements to the interchange are currently under construction and would fully mitigate the direct project impacts. As mentioned previously for impact TR-1, the interchange improvements are fully funded and construction is anticipated to be completed in fall 2017. Thus, the project's Genesee Avenue/I-5 ramp impact would remain temporarily significant and unmitigated until the Caltrans improvements are completed.

### Impact TR-4: Genesee Avenue/La Jolla Village Drive

Impact TR-4 consists of both direct and cumulative impacts occurring at the Genesee Avenue/La Jolla Village Drive intersection. The proposed mitigation for the project's impact at the Genesee Avenue/La Jolla Village Drive intersection would be to widen the northbound approach to provide a dedicated right turn lane. These improvements are fully funded and expected to begin construction in early 2017 as part of the University Towne Center (UTC) Revitalization Project. In the event that the UTC project does not provide the requisite funding, the project would be responsible for 100 percent of this improvement. However, project impacts to the Genesee Avenue/La Jolla Village Drive intersection will remain significant and temporarily unmitigated in the short term until construction of the improvements are completed.

### Impact TR-5: Campus Point Drive/Campus Point Court

The direct and cumulative impacts at the intersection of Campus Point Drive and Campus Point Court would be mitigated as follows:

**TR-5:** Prior to the issuance of the first building permit for the applicant shall assure by permit and bond the signalization of the Campus Point Drive/Campus Point Court intersection, to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. Installation of the signal and associated improvements shall be completed and accepted by the City Engineer prior to issuance of the first occupancy permit.

# 4.2.3.4 Significance of Impacts after Mitigation

### a. Street Segments

### Impact TR-1: Genesee Avenue between the I-5 SB and NB ramps

The Caltrans I-5/Genesee Avenue Interchange Project is currently under construction and would mitigate the project's significant direct impact (Impact TR-1) to the Genesee Avenue bridge segment. Specifically, the bridge improvement to a six-lane Prime Arterial would result in a LOS D capacity of 60,000. As the roadway volumes in the Existing with Project and Near-term with Project conditions would be below 60,000, the roadway segment would operate at an acceptable LOS C after the implementation of the Caltrans improvements. The Caltrans project that includes these improvements is fully funded and under construction, but is not anticipated to be completed until fall 2017, which would potentially be after the buildout of the proposed project. Further, completion of these improvements even by fall 2017 cannot be assured because these improvements are out of the control of the City and the applicant. As such, this Genesee Avenue (Impact TR-3) impact would potentially remain significant and unmitigated temporarily between the occupancy of the project and completion of the I-5/Genesee Avenue Interchange Project.

### Impact TR-2: Campus Point Drive between Genesee Avenue and Campus Point Court

Payment of 19.41 percent fair share fees towards the removal of parking on the east side of Campus Point Drive and restriping to include an additional northbound lane would fully mitigate the project's cumulative impact to Campus Point Drive. Impacts would be less than significant.

# **b.** Intersections

### Impact TR-3: Genesee Avenue/I-5 SB Ramp

Similar to Impact TR-1, the Caltrans improvements at I-5 and Genesee Avenue are currently under construction and would mitigate the project's significant direct impact (Impact TR-3) to the Genesee Avenue/I-5 SB ramp intersection. The Caltrans project that includes these improvements is fully funded and under construction, but is not anticipated to be completed until fall 2017, which would potentially be after the buildout of the proposed project. As such, Impact TR-3 would also remain significant and unmitigated temporarily between the occupancy of the project and completion of the I-5/Genesee Avenue Interchange Project.

### Impact TR-4: Genesee Avenue/La Jolla Village Drive

The proposed mitigation for the project's impact at the Genesee Avenue/La Jolla Village Drive intersection would be to widen the northbound approach to provide a dedicated right-turn lane. These improvements are fully funded and expected to begin construction in early 2017 as part of the University Towne Center Revitalization Project. The direct and cumulative impacts would be considered temporarily significant and unmitigated in the short term until the improvements are complete.

### Impact TR-5: Campus Point Drive/Campus Point Court

Installation of the signal and associated improvements at the Campus Point Drive/Campus Point Court intersection would fully mitigate impacts to below a level of significance.

# 4.2.4 Issue 3: Traffic Generation

Would the project result in traffic generation in excess of specific community plan allocation?

# 4.2.4.1 Impacts

The project would increase the development intensity to a total of 1,060,108 square feet (731,725 existing plus 328,383 proposed) on a net acreage of 40.28 acres, which is an intensity of 26,318.5 square feet per net acre (sf/ac) and within the allowable 30,000 sf/ac allowable development intensity. However, as discussed in Section 4.1.3.1(a), the UCP specifies that the project site is allowed a development intensity of 30,000 sf/ac but it must mitigate peak-hour traffic to a level less than or equal to 18,000 sf/ac through a Transportation System Management (TSM) program. The UCP states that "[d]evelopment intensity and traffic generation will not be the sole factor upon which consistency will be judged" and that this requirement is intended to "ensure a workable circulation system."

The project would include a TDM (equivalent to a TSM) which would encourage employees to utilize carpools and alternative transportation to reduce vehicle trips. While the project would include a TDM Program, it is not feasible for the City or applicant to control employees' transportation choices to guarantee that peak hour trips would be reduced to the equivalent of an 18,000 sf/ac development required by the UCP. Thus, the project would not be consistent with the UCP's requirement to mitigate trip generation to a level equivalent to an 18,000 sf/ac project. Therefore, as described in the Project Description chapter and the Land Use section 4.1.3.1(a)), the project proposes a Community Plan Amendment (CPA) to remove the requirement to "mitigate its peak hour trip generation rate to a level equal to or less than which would be generated by a project of 18,000 sf/ac." Thus, this impact would be avoided through the proposed community plan amendment and no significant impacts would occur.

# 4.2.4.2 Significance of Impacts

As indicated above, the UCP allows the project site to have an intensity up to 30,000 sf/ac, but requires it to mitigate peak-hour traffic to a level less than or equal to 18,000 sf/ac through a TSM. Since the project would implement a TDM, but the TDM is not guaranteed to reduce trips to below the 18,000 sf/ac equivalency, the project proposes a community plan amendment which, upon approval, would avoid this impact. No mitigation would be required.

# 4.2.4.3 Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting

Impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

# 4.2.5 Issue 4: Freeways, Interchanges, and Ramps

Would the project result in the addition of a substantial amount of traffic to a congested freeway segment, interchange, or ramp?

# 4.2.5.1 Impacts

## a. Freeway Analysis

Freeway segments are analyzed where the project would add 50 or more peak hour directional trips. One segment south and one segment north on I-5 were evaluated for this analysis. The project would contribute less than 50 peak hour directional trips to all other freeway segments.

As detailed in Appendix C, these I-5 freeway segments would operate at acceptable levels under the Existing and Existing with Project conditions, Near-term and Near-term with Project conditions, and Horizon Year and Horizon Year with Project conditions. Thus, the project would have a less than significant direct and cumulative impacts to freeway segments.

## b. Ramp Meter Analysis

As ramp meters do not currently exist at the I-5/Genesee Avenue freeway ramp locations, a ramp meter analysis was not completed for the existing conditions analysis. Freeway ramp meters at I-5/Genesee Avenue are proposed to be installed with the future interchange/bridge improvements expected to be completed in fall 2017. Therefore, the TIA (see Appendix C) evaluated ramp meters for the Near-term and all subsequent scenarios. As detailed in Appendix C and Tables 4.2-12 and 4.2-13, there would be delays that exceed the threshold for the I-5 NB in both the AM and PM peak hours as well as for the SB ramp in the AM peak hour; however, the freeway segments near the ramps currently operate at LOS C and D. Therefore, the project would not cause significant direct or cumulative impacts with respect to ramp meters.

Table 4.2-12 Near-term & Near-term with Project Ramp Meter Analysis Comparison (most restrictive meter rate)											
Delay Queue Delay Queue Freeway											
Location		(Min)	(ft)	(Min)	(ft)	LOS	Δ	Significant?			
Genesee Ave./I-5 NB On-Ramp	AM	185.11	6,859	188.28	6,977	C	3.17	No			
(SOV)	PM	72.56	16,951	76.69	17,917	C	4.13	No			
Genesee Ave./I-5 NB On-Ramp	AM	0.00	0	0.00	0	(	0.00	No			
(HOV)	PM	0.00	0	0.00	0	C	0.00	No			
Genesee Ave./I-5 SB On-Ramp	AM	0.00	0	0.00	0	ſ	0.00	No			
(SOV)	PM	8.45	2,721	9.62	3,100	D	1.17	No			
Genesee Ave./I-5 NB On-Ramp	AM	0.00	0	0.00	0	(	0.00	No			
(HOV)	PM	0.00	0	0.00	0	D	0.00	No			
NOTE: Significant, if change i greater than 1 minute and Free		, 0	er than 2	minutes	and Freev	vay LOS is E	or chan	ge in delay is			

 $\Delta$  = change in Delay (minutes)

SOV = single occupancy vehicle

HOV = high occupancy vehicle

Table 4.2-13 Horizon Year 2035 & Horizon Year 2035 with Project Ramp Meter Analysis (most postrictive motor rate)											
(most restrictive meter rate)											
		Delay	Queue	Delay	Queue	Freeway					
Location		(Min)	(ft)	(Min)	(ft)	LOS	Δ	Significant?			
Genesee Ave./I-5 NB On-Ramp	AM	309.78	11,479	312.95	11,597	D	3.17	No			
(SOV)	РM	76.97	17,982	81.11	18,948	D	4.13	No			
Genesee Ave./I-5 NB On-Ramp	AM	22.17	822	22.88	848	D	0.70	No			
(HOV)	PM	0.00	0	0.00	0	D	0.00	No			
Genesee Ave./I-5 SB On-Ramp	AM	21.17	1,671	21.83	1,723	D	0.66	No			
(SOV)	РM	26.27	8,463	27.44	8,842	D	1.17	No			
Genesee Ave./I-5 NB On-Ramp	AM	0.00	0	0.00	0	D	0.00	No			
(HOV)	PM	0.00	0	0.00	0	D	0.00	No			
NOTE: Significant, if change is greater than 1 minute and Free $\Delta$ = change in Delay (minutes)		, 0	er than 2	minutes	and Freev	vay LOS is E	or chan	ge in delay is			

A = change in Delay (minutes)

SOV = single occupancy vehicle

HOV = high occupancy vehicle

# 4.2.5.2 Significance of Impacts

### a. Freeway Analysis

All I-5 freeway segments in the study area would operate at acceptable levels under the Existing and Existing with Project conditions, Near-term and Near-term with Project conditions, and Horizon Year and Horizon Year with Project conditions. Thus, direct and cumulative project impacts to freeway segments would be less than significant.

# b. Ramp Meter Analysis

While the Genesee Avenue/I-5 NB on-ramp would have a delay over 15 minutes in both the Nearterm and Horizon Year conditions, the freeway segments along this ramp location would operate acceptably. Thus, direct and cumulative project impacts to ramp meters would be less than significant.

# 4.2.5.3 Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting

Impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

# 4.2.6 Issues 5 and 6: Access and Traffic Hazards

Would the project result in substantial alteration to present circulation movements including effects on existing public access to beaches, parks, or other open space areas?

Would the project increase traffic hazards for motor vehicles, bicyclists, or pedestrians due to proposed nonstandard design features (e.g., poor sight distance or driveway onto an access-restricted roadway)?

# 4.2.6.1 Impacts

The project has three existing access points via Campus Pointe Drive. These access points connect to a private driveway which is an extension to Campus Point Drive. There is also a cul-de-sac which serves as the terminus of the publicly maintained portion of Campus Point Drive. One of the proposed private driveways, which would provide internal circulation for the project, would link to the cul-de-sac. These locations would provide access for pedestrians, bicycles, and motor vehicles. Internal drives and sidewalks would provide access to the proposed parking structures and buildings. Access and roadway improvements included as a part of the project and mitigation identified above would be completed pursuant to the City's roadway standards and emergency access requirements (see Sections 3.3.2 and 3.3.3). The sidewalks on Campus Point Drive connect to the rest of the community, including the Class II bike lanes and bus route 979 on Genesee Avenue. These design features would ensure that the project would not create traffic hazards to motor vehicles, bicycles, or pedestrians. Thus, the project would result in less than significant access and traffic hazard impacts.

# 4.2.6.2 Significance of Impacts

Impacts to traffic hazards and emergency access would be less than significant.

# 4.2.6.3 Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting

Impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

# 4.2.7 Issue 7: Alternative Transportation

Would the project result in a conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation models (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?

# 4.2.7.1 Impacts

The project includes a TDM program that supports alternative transportation modes. The project's TDM is identified in Section 3.2.5. Specific bicycle TDM measures include providing bike lockers, showers, and a bike-share program. The project would also encourage transit use by providing a private shuttle system between the project and local transit stations, and requesting tenants provide discount transit passes for employees. Carpooling would also be encouraged through the project, as it would include priority parking for carpools, carpool association, and carpooling incentive program. The project would also promote the dissemination of alternative transportation information to employees via an informational bulletin board, a TDM association/coordinator, and quarterly newsletters. Thus, the project would be consistent with the UCP's goal to encourage alternative transportation and the General Plan Mobility Element's walkable communities, transit, bicycling, and transportation demand management goals (see Table 4.1-1).

# 4.2.7.2 Significance of Impacts

Impacts to alternative modes of transportation would be less than significant.

# 4.2.7.3 Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting

Impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

# 4.2.8 Comparison to the 1993 FEIR

The 1993 FEIR concluded the project would cause reductions in LOS resulting in significant and unmitigated direct impacts to the Regents Road segment south of Genesee; as well as to the Genesee Avenue intersections at Campus Point Drive, Regents Road, and Eastgate Mall. The project's impacts to Campus Point Drive were found to be mitigated through implementation of the TDM program.

Table 4.2-14 provides a summary of the impacts discussed in the 1993 FEIR compared to those found in the current TIA. As shown in Table 4.2-14, the 1993 FEIR concluded significant cumulative impacts at most of the Genesee Avenue segments analyzed as well as all of the Genesee intersections in the study area with the exception of the Genesee Avenue/La Jolla Village Drive intersection. The 1993 FEIR states that while the project would make its fair share contribution of fees toward mitigation pursuant to the University PFFP, only the No Project Alternative or another alternative site in another community which has no significant cumulative traffic impacts would avoid the significant cumulative impacts associated with the project. Therefore, the cumulative impacts called out as significant in the table were concluded to be significant and unmitigated.

		Table 4.2-14					
	Imp	act Comparison 1					
		Direct	Impacts	Cumulat	ive Impacts		
Road	Street Segment	1993 EIR	Proposed Project	1993 EIR	Proposed TIA		
Genesee Avenue	West of Interstate 5	Not significant	Significant, unmitigated	Significant, unmitigated	Not significant		
	Interstate 5 to Campus Point Drive	Not significant	Not significant	Significant, unmitigated	Not significant		
	Campus Point Dr. to Regents Rd.	Not significant	Not significant	Significant, unmitigated	Not significant		
	Regents Rd to Eastgate Mall	Not significant	Not significant	Not significant	Not significant		
	Eastgate Mall to La Jolla Village Dr.	Not significant	Not significant	Not significant	Not significant		
Campus Point Drive	North of Genesee Ave.	Significant	Not significant	Not significant	Significant		
Regents Road	South of Genesee Ave.	Significant, unmitigated	Not studied	Not significant	Not studied		
Eastgate Mall	East of Genesee Ave.	Not significant	N/A	Not significant	N/A		
	West of Genesee Ave.	Not significant	N/A	Not significant	N/A		
La Jolla Village Drive	East of Genesee Ave.	Not significant	N/A	Not significant	N/A		
	West of Genesee Ave.	Not significant	N/A	Significant, unmitigated	N/A		
		Direct	Impacts	Cumulative Impacts			
	Intersection	1993 EIR	Proposed Project	1993 EIR	Proposed TIA		
Genesee Ave./I-5		Not significant	Significant, unmitigated	Significant, unmitigated	Not significant		
Genesee Ave./I-5	NB Ramp	Not significant	Not significant	Significant, unmitigated	Not significant		
Genesee Ave./Ca	ampus Point Dr.	Significant, unmitigated	Not significant	Significant, unmitigated	Not significant		
Genesee Ave./Re	egents Road	Significant, unmitigated	Not significant	Significant, unmitigated	Not significant		
Genesee Ave./Ea	•	Significant	Not significant	Significant, unmitigated	Not significant		
Genesee Ave./Ex Genesee Ave./La		N/A Not significant	Not significant Significant, Unmitigated	N/A Not significant	Not significant Significant, Unmitigated		
Campus Point Dr	ive/Campus Point Court	N/A	Significant	N/A	Significant		

As shown in Table 4.2-14, the proposed project is anticipated to have fewer direct and cumulative impacts compared to those discussed in the 1993 FEIR. Impacts TR-1 and TR-3 are temporarily significant only until such time that the Caltrans improvements to the I-5/Genesee bridge are completed in fall of 2017. Similarly, impact TR-4 would be temporarily significant until the dedicated right-turn lane is constructed (scheduled to begin February 2017) at Genesee Avenue and La Jolla Village Drive are constructed.

# 4.3 **Biological Resources**

This section assesses the potential for project development to impact sensitive biological resources, including plant and wildlife species. The 1993 FEIR addressed biological resources in Chapter 5, Effects Not Found to be Significant. The discussion concludes that while the site was found to contain native vegetation, including coastal sage scrub, along the northern, northeastern, and eastern edges, the proposed development would be limited to the already graded portions of the site. Further, the 1993 FEIR states that "open space easements or non-building easements are shown on the vesting tentative map (VTM) over surrounding slopes including all areas of native vegetation with the exception of a small patch immediately north of IVAC. This area would be included in a negative open space easement as a condition of the VTM."

Since the preparation of the 1993 FEIR, the City adopted the Multiple Species Conservation Plan (MSCP) Subarea Plan (March 1997), with the goal of conserving sensitive biological resources while allowing for reasonable economic growth. Non-native grassland is considered a sensitive habitat as it provides foraging area for many species, and is especially valuable for raptors as hunting grounds. In addition, there is a potential for raptors and migratory birds to nest on-site due to the presence of large eucalyptus trees as well as suitable Diegan coastal sage scrub and non-native grassland habitat.

General biological surveys were conducted in July 2014 and November 2015, in accordance with the City's Biology Guidelines (2012), to assess the biological resources on-site with a potential to be impacted by the project; and the biological technical report (August 24, 2016) is included as Appendix D to this EIR. This section updates the 1993 FEIR by providing a summary of the biological technical report and recommended mitigation measures.

# 4.3.1 Existing Conditions

# 4.3.1.1 Existing Vegetation Communities and Land Cover Types

As listed in Table 4.3-1, four vegetation/land cover types occur within the project site: Diegan coastal sage scrub, non-native grassland, eucalyptus woodland, and urban/developed (Figure 4.3-1). A total of 104 plant species were identified on the site. Of these 104 species, 32 are considered native to California and 72 are considered non-native species.





#### **Vegetation Classification**



Off-site Improvement Area

- Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub
- Eucalyptus Woodland
- Non-Native Grassland

Urban\Developed

FIGURE 4.3-1

**Existing Biological Resources** 

Table 4.3-1 Existing Vegetation Communities/Land Cover Types within the Project Area												
				Off-	Off-site							
		Project Site		Improven								
		Inside	Outside	Inside	Outside							
	City of	Existing	Existing	Existing	Existing							
Habitat Types	San Diego	MHPA	MHPA	MHPA	MHPA							
(City of San Diego 2012)	Tier	(acres)	(acres)	(acres)	(acres)	Acreage						
Coastal Sage Scrub	Ш	6.95	1.79	-	-	8.74						
Non-Native Grassland	III-B	0.61	3.64	-	-	4.25						
Eucalyptus Woodland	IV	1.41	3.93	-	-	5.34						
Urban/Developed	-	1.08	38.80	0.03	0.19	40.10						
TOTAL	-	10.05	48.16	0.03	0.19	58.43						

### a. Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub

Diegan coastal sage scrub occurs predominantly along the eastern boundary, with an isolated patch occurring in the northwestern corner (see Figure 4.3-1). The Diegan coastal sage scrub is dominated by black sage (*Salvia mellifera*), California sagebrush (*Artemisia californica*), lemonadeberry (*Rhus integrifolia*), and coastal California buckwheat (*Eriogonum fasciculatum* var. *fasciculatum*).

### b. Non-Native Grassland

Non-native grassland occurs along the northwestern boundary of the project site (see Figure 4.3-1). The non-native grassland is dominated by rip-gut brome (*Bromus diandrus*), wild oats (*Avena fatua*), red brome (*Bromus madritensis*), and black mustard (*Brassica nigra*).

### c. Eucalyptus Woodland

Eucalyptus woodland primarily occurs on manufactured slopes and road shoulders along parking lots and Campus Point Drive, in the northern and eastern portions of the project site (see Figure 4.3-1). The eucalyptus woodland is dominated by red gum (*Eucalyptus camaldulensis*), with western coastal wattle (*Acacia cyclops*), Peruvian pepper tree (*Schinus molle*), and ornamental Torrey pine (*Pinus torreyana*). Low-lying non-native vegetation and scattered shrubs occur in the understory.

### d. Urban/Developed

Urban/developed land occurs within the central portion of the project site (see Figure 4.3-1). The urban/developed land consists of previously constructed paved roads, buildings, parking lots, and landscaping. Many native plant species are planted within landscaping, such as ornamental Torrey pines, deergrass (*Muhlenbergia rigens*), and foothill needlegrass (*Stipa lepida*).

# 4.3.1.2 Sensitive Vegetation Communities

Sensitive vegetation communities are those communities that are of highly limited distribution. These communities may also support concentrations of sensitive plant or wildlife species. Two habitats within the project site are considered sensitive under the City's MSCP (City of San Diego 1997): Diegan coastal sage scrub and non-native grassland. No wetlands occur within the project site. The sensitive vegetation communities present within the project site are shown on Figure 4.3-1 and discussed in further detail below.

## a. Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub

Diegan coastal sage scrub is considered a sensitive habitat by the City and other regional resource protection agencies. This is due to the scarcity of this vegetation community and the number of sensitive species associated with it. Conservation of coastal sage scrub habitats is an important planning issue throughout southern California. This vegetation community is an MSCP Tier II (uncommon upland).

## b. Non-native Grassland

Non-native grassland is considered a sensitive habitat by the City and other regional resource protection agencies. Grasslands provide foraging area for many species, and are especially valuable for raptors as hunting grounds. Conservation of grasslands is an important planning issue throughout southern California. Non-native grasslands are classified as MSCP Tier III-B (common upland). Tier III-B habitat is considered less valuable than native habitat, but still performs many of the same biological functions.

# 4.3.1.3 Sensitive Plant Species

One sensitive plant species, Torrey pine, was observed on the project site. However, these Torrey pine trees are located within landscaping and on a manufactured slope adjacent to Campus Point Drive and are not part of a naturally occurring population of the species. Therefore, these particular Torrey pine trees are not considered a sensitive biological resource.

Although not detected on-site, beach goldenaster (*Heterotheca sessiliflora* ssp. *sessiliflora*), Robinson's peppergrass (*Lepidium virginicum* var. *robinsonii*), and aphanisma (*Aphanisma blitoides*) have potential to occur due to the presence of suitable Diegan coastal sage scrub on-site.

No other species are known to occur in the project vicinity (within two miles of the project site) which are federally listed threatened or endangered, considered a City narrow endemic, or have potential to occur based on species range, and are discussed in further detail in Appendix D.

# 4.3.1.4 Sensitive Wildlife Species

No sensitive wildlife species were observed or detected at the time of the survey. Species that are known to occur in the project vicinity (within two miles of the project site) which are federally listed

threatened or endangered, or have potential to occur based on species range are discussed in further detail in Appendix D.

**Coastal California gnatcatcher (***Polioptila californica californica***)** is a federally threatened species, California species of concern, and MSCP-covered species. Coastal California gnatcatcher has potential to nest and forage within the Diegan coastal sage scrub along the northwestern and southeastern boundary of the project site (see Figure 4.3-1).

**Southern California rufous-crowned sparrow (***Aimophila ruficeps canescens***)** is a California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) species of special concern and MSCP-covered species. Southern California rufous-crowned sparrow has potential to nest and forage within the Diegan coastal sage scrub along the northwestern and southeastern boundary of the project site (see Figure 4.3-1).

**Southern mule deer (***Odocoileus hemionus fuliginata***)** is a MSCP-covered species. Southern mule deer has potential to occur within the project area due to the site's location within a canyon system and the presence of suitable native habitats.

There is potential for **raptors** and **migratory birds**, including the MSCP-covered Cooper's hawk (*Accipiter cooperi*), to nest on-site due to the presence of large eucalyptus trees and suitable Diegan coastal sage scrub and non-native grassland habitat.

# 4.3.1.5 Wildlife Movement Corridors

Wildlife movement corridors are defined as areas that allow wildlife to travel between suitable wildlife habitat areas in a region otherwise fragmented by rugged terrain, changes in vegetation, or human disturbance. They may be present in canyon drainages, ridgelines, or areas with vegetation cover. 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). These corridors are considered sensitive by the City and resource and conservation agencies.

The project site is located on the edge of an un-named urban canyon system, which is immediately restricted by Interstate 5 to the north and west and residential and commercial development to the south. The canyon continues to the east, where it ultimately connects with Soledad Canyon. Although it is reasonable to assume that wildlife movement may occur locally within the project site, the project site as a whole does not provide a regional throughway for wildlife species and, therefore, does not function as a significant regional corridor.

# 4.3.1.6 Regulatory Framework

### a. Natural Habitat Conservation and Planning

The Natural Community Conservation Planning (NCCP) program was enacted by the State of California in 1991 to provide long-term regional protection of natural vegetation and wildlife diversity while allowing compatible development. The NCCP process was initiated to provide an

alternative to single-species conservation efforts (habitat conservation plans). Instead, the NCCP is intended to provide a regional approach to the protection of species within a designated natural community. In the City, the MSCP is an outgrowth of this planning.

### b. Multiple Species Conservation Program

The MSCP is a comprehensive, long-term habitat conservation planning program that covers approximately 900 square miles in southwestern San Diego County under the federal and state Endangered Species Acts and state NCCP Act of 1991. The planned MSCP regional preserve is targeted at 172,000 acres. Local jurisdictions, including the City, implement their portions of the regional umbrella MSCP through Subarea Plans, which describe specific implementing mechanisms. The City's MSCP Subarea Plan was approved in March 1997. The City's MSCP study area includes 206,124 acres within its municipal boundaries. The City's planned MSCP preserve totals 56,831 acres, with 52,012 acres (90 percent) targeted for preservation. In 2004, the City committed to increasing the conservation target by 715 acres in association with revisions to the City's brush management regulations in response to local fires.

The MSCP Subarea Plan is a plan and process for the issuance of incidental take permits for federal and state listed listed and MSCP-covered species under Section 10(a)(1)(B) of the federal Endangered Species Act and Section 2835 under the state Endangered Species Act. The primary goal of the MSCP Subarea Plan is to conserve viable populations of sensitive species and to conserve regional biodiversity while allowing for reasonable economic growth. In July 1997, the City signed an Implementing Agreement with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). The Implementing Agreement serves as a binding contract between the City, the USFWS, and the CDFW that identifies the roles and responsibilities of the parties to implement the MSCP and Subarea Plan. The agreement allows the City to issue incidental take authorizations for "MSCP Covered" species. Applicable state and federal permits are still required for wetlands and listed species that are not covered by the MSCP.

"MSCP Covered" refers to species covered by the City's federal incidental take permit (ITP) issued pursuant to Section 10(a) of the Federal Endangered Species Act (FESA; 16 United States Code [U.S.C.] § 1539(a)(2)(A)). Under the FESA, an ITP is required when non-federal activities would result in "take" of a threatened or endangered species. A habitat conservation plan (HCP) must accompany an application for a federal ITP. Take authorization for federally listed wildlife species covered in the HCP shall generally be effective upon approval of the HCP.

# c. Multi-Habitat Planning Area

One of the primary objectives of the MSCP is to identify and maintain a preserve system which allows for animals and plants to exist at both the local and regional levels. The MSCP has identified large blocks of native habitat having the ability to support a diversity of plant and animal life known as "core biological resource areas." "Linkages" between these core areas provide for wildlife movement. These lands have been determined to provide the necessary habitat quality, quantity, and connectivity to sustain the unique biodiversity of the San Diego region. Input from responsible agencies and other interested participants resulted in creation of the City's Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA). The MHPA is the area within which the permanent MSCP preserve would be assembled and managed for its biological resources.

In accordance with the MSCP, for parcels located outside the MHPA:

There is no limit on encroachments into sensitive biological resources, with the exception of wetlands and listed non-covered species' habitat (which are regulated by federal and state agencies and narrow endemic species as described below) ... impacts to sensitive biological resources must be assessed, and mitigation, where necessary, must be provided in conformance with Section III of [the City's Biology Guidelines] (City of San Diego 2012).

The project site is located in the 'Urban Area' within the City of San Diego's MSCP Subarea (City of San Diego 1997). A total of 10.08 acres of the project site is located within the MHPA, and the portion of the site outside of the MHPA (48.33 acres) is directly adjacent to MHPA (see Figure 2-8).

### d. MHPA Land Use Adjacency Guidelines

To address the integrity of the MHPA, Section 1.4.3 Land Use Adjacency Guidelines of the City of San Diego's MSCP Subarea Plan (1997) identifies guidelines to manage land uses adjacent to the MHPA. The adjacency guidelines are intended to be addressed on a project-by-project basis and addressed in the discretionary stage and implemented in the ministerial phase. These guidelines address the issues of drainage, toxics, lighting, noise, invasives, brush management, access to MHPA, and grading/land development. These guidelines are discussed in further detail in Section 4.1, Land Use.

### e. Land Development Code/Environmentally Sensitive Lands

On December 9, 1997, the Environmentally Sensitive Lands (ESL) Regulations were adopted by ordinance as a part of the Land Development Code (LDC). The purpose of the ESL Regulations is to protect and preserve environmentally sensitive lands (e.g., sensitive biological resources, steep hillsides, coastal beaches, sensitive coastal bluffs, and special flood hazard areas), along with the viability of the species supported by those lands. The regulations are intended to assure that development occurs in a manner that protects the overall quality of the resources and the natural and topographic character of the area. The ESL defines "sensitive biological resources" as those lands included within the MHPA as identified in the MSCP Subarea Plan, and other lands outside of the MHPA that contain: wetlands; vegetation communities classifiable as Tier I, II, IIIA or IIIB; habitat for rare, endangered, or threatened species; or narrow endemic species.

### f. Land Development Manual/Biology Guidelines

The Biology Guidelines, revised and adopted in 2012, aid in the implementation and interpretation of ESL Regulations. Also, Section III of these Guidelines (Biological Impact Analysis and Mitigation Procedures) serves as standards for the determination of impact and mitigation under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

# g. California Fish and Game Code and Migratory Bird Treaty Act

Raptors (birds of prey) and active raptor nests, as well as most other bird nests, are protected by the California Fish and Game Code 3503, which states that it is "unlawful to take, possess, or destroy any birds of prey or to take, possess, or destroy the nest or eggs of any such bird" unless authorized. In addition, active nests of most bird species are protected during the breeding season under the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA).

# h. City of San Diego Significance Determination Thresholds

Potential impacts to biological resources are assessed through review of the project's consistency with the City's ESL Regulations, Biology Guidelines, and MSCP Subarea Plan. Before a determination of the significance of an impact can be made, the presence and nature of the biological resources must be established. Thus, significance determination, pursuant to the City's Significance Determination Thresholds, proceeds in two steps: (1) determine if significant biological resources are present; and (2) determine the sensitivity of identified biological resources in terms of direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts that would result from project implementation.

- 1. Sensitive biological resources are defined by the City of San Diego Municipal Code as:
  - Lands that have been included in the MHPA as identified in the City of San Diego MSCP Subarea Plan (City of San Diego 1997);
  - Wetlands (as defined by the Municipal Code, Section 113.0103);
  - Lands outside the MHPA that contain Tier I Habitats, Tier II Habitats, Tier IIIA Habitats, or Tier IIIB Habitats as identified in the Biology Guidelines (July 2002 or current edition) of the Land Development manual;
  - Lands supporting species or subspecies listed as rare, endangered, or threatened;
  - Lands containing habitats with narrow endemic species as listed in the Biology Guidelines of the Land Development manual; and
  - Lands containing habitats of covered species as listed in the Biology Guidelines of the Land Development manual.

The criteria to determining the significance of biological resource impacts pursuant to the City's Significance Determination Thresholds are described in Section 4.3.1.7 below.

# 4.3.2 Determination of Impact Significance

Based on the City's 2011 Significance Determination Thresholds, existence of any of the following situations associated with the project site may indicate the presence of significant biological resources:

- 1. The site has been identified as part of the MHPA by the City's MSCP Subarea Plan;
- 2. The site supports or could support Tier I, II, IIIA, or IIIB vegetation communities (such as grassland, chaparral, coastal sage scrub);
- 3. The site contains, or comes within 100 feet of, a natural or man-made drainage; or
- 4. The site does not support a "covered" (per the MSCP) vegetation community; however, important wildlife species may use the site for a corridor, etc.

### 4.3.2.1 Direct Impacts

- Any encroachment in the MHPA is considered a significant impact to the preservation goals of the MSCP. Any encroachment into the MHPA (in excess of the allowable encroachment by a project) would require a boundary adjustment, which would include a habitat equivalency assessment to ensure that what would be added to the MHPA is at least equivalent to what would be removed.
- Lands containing Tier I, II, IIIA, and IIIB habitats and all wetlands are considered sensitive and declining habitats. Impacts to these resources may be considered significant.
- Impacts to individual sensitive species, outside of any impacts to habitat, may also be considered significant based upon the rarity and extent of impacts. Impacts to state or federally listed species and all narrow endemics should be considered significant.
- Certain species covered by the MSCP and other species not covered by the MSCP may be considered significant on a case-by-case basis, taking into consideration all pertinent information regarding distribution, rarity, and the level of habitat conservation afforded by the MSCP.

### 4.3.2.1 Indirect Impacts

The Significance Determination Thresholds indicate that depending on the circumstances, indirect effects of a project may be as significant as the direct effects of the project. Indirect effects include, but are not limited to, the following impacts:

- Introduction of urban meso-predators into a biological system.
- Introduction of urban runoff into a biological system.
- Introduction of invasive exotic plant species into a biological system.
- Noise and lighting impacts.
- Alteration of a dynamic portion of a system, such as stream flow characteristics or fire cycles.
- Loss of a wetland buffer that includes no environmentally sensitive lands.

# 4.3.3 Issue 1: Sensitive Species

Would the project result in a substantial adverse impact, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in the MSCP or other local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the CDFW or USFWS?

# 4.3.3.1 Impacts

### a. Plant Species

No sensitive plant species were observed within the project site at the time of the survey. Although not detected on-site, beach goldenaster (*Heterotheca sessiliflora* ssp. *sessiliflora*), Robinson's peppergrass (*Lepidium virginicum* var. *robinsonii*), and aphansima (*Aphanisma blitoides*) have a moderate potential to occur within the project site. Direct impacts to these species may occur outside of the MHPA through the removal of suitable Diegan coastal sage scrub habitat; however, all proposed development will occur within previously disturbed areas and there is no encroachment into sensitive habitat. Direct impacts that may occur to aphanisma outside of the MHPA are permitted through the MSCP. Impacts to beach goldenaster and Robinson's peppergrass would not be considered significant as these species are considered rare by CNPS, but are not covered by the MSCP and have no federal or state status. The MSCP conserves significant amounts of habitat for these species. Therefore, impacts to sensitive plant species would be less than significant.

# b. Wildlife Species

**Coastal California Gnatcatcher.** Indirect impacts to coastal California gnatcatcher could potentially result from excessive noise and lighting generated from project construction should grading occur within or adjacent to occupied habitat in the MHPA during the breeding season (March 1–August 15).

**Nesting birds.** Direct impacts to nesting or migratory birds, including nesting Cooper's hawk and other raptors, could potentially result from the removal of eucalyptus woodland and mature landscape vegetation on-site. Direct impacts to nesting or migratory birds, including raptors, would be potentially significant.

# 4.3.3.2 Significance of Impacts

### a. Plant Species

No sensitive plant species were observed within the project site at the time of the survey. Impacts to aphanisma through the removal of habitat outside of the MHPA are permitted through the MSCP and would not be considered significant. Impacts to beach goldenaster and Robinson's peppergrass would not be considered significant as the MHPA adequately conserves habitat for these species. Therefore, impacts to sensitive plant species would be less than significant.

## b. Wildlife Species

No coastal California gnatcatcher or raptor nests were observed on-site; however, there is potential for nesting coastal California gnatcatcher, raptors, and other nesting and migratory birds within the project area. Direct impacts to nesting raptors and other birds could result from the removal of eucalyptus woodland and mature landscape vegetation on-site. Direct impacts to migratory or nesting birds would be considered significant. Indirect impacts to coastal California gnatcatcher could result from excessive noise and lighting generated from project construction should grading occur within or adjacent to occupied habitat in the MHPA during the breeding season (March 1–August 15). Indirect impacts to nesting coastal California gnatcatcher would be considered significant without mitigation measures.

# 4.3.3.3 Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting

### a. Plant Species

Impacts to sensitive plant species would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

### **b. Wildlife Species**

Direct impacts to sensitive wildlife species, including nesting raptors and migratory birds would be mitigated to a level that is less than significant through mitigation measures BIO-1 and BIO-2. Indirect Impacts to nesting coastal California gnatcatcher and other sensitive resources within the MHPA would be mitigated to a level that is less than significant through mitigation measure LU-1.

### **Nesting Birds/Raptors**

**BIO-1:** Due to the moderate to high potential of Cooper's hawk occurrences, in the event construction occurs in or near the MHPA within the breeding season (February 1 to September 15), an avoidance area of 300 feet from any Cooper's hawk nest that occurs within the MHPA shall be required. Additionally, BIO-2 shall be implemented.

### **Biological Resource Protection During Construction**

#### BIO-2:

- I. Prior to Construction
  - A. **Biologist Verification** -The owner/permittee shall provide a letter to the City's Mitigation Monitoring Coordination (MMC) section stating that a Project Biologist (Qualified Biologist) as defined in the City of San Diego's Biological Guidelines (2012), has been retained to implement the project's biological monitoring program. The letter shall include the names and contact information of all persons involved in the biological monitoring of the project.
  - B. **Preconstruction Meeting** The Qualified Biologist shall attend the preconstruction meeting, discuss the project's biological monitoring program, and arrange to perform any

follow up mitigation measures and reporting including site-specific monitoring, restoration or revegetation, and additional fauna/flora surveys/salvage.

- C. **Biological Documents** The Qualified Biologist shall submit all required documentation to MMC verifying that any special mitigation reports including but not limited to, maps, plans, surveys, survey timelines, or buffers are completed or scheduled per City Biology Guidelines, Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP), Environmentally Sensitive Lands Ordinance (ESL), project permit conditions; California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA); endangered species acts (ESAs); and/or other local, state or federal requirements.
- D. BCME The Qualified Biologist shall present a Biological Construction Mitigation/Monitoring Exhibit (BCME) which includes the biological documents in C above. In addition, include: restoration/revegetation plans, plant salvage/relocation requirements (e.g., coastal cactus wren plant salvage, burrowing owl exclusions, etc.), avian or other wildlife surveys/survey schedules (including general avian nesting and USFWS protocol), timing of surveys, wetland buffers, avian construction avoidance areas/noise buffers/ barriers, other impact avoidance areas, and any subsequent requirements determined by the Qualified Biologist and the City ADD/MMC. The BCME shall include a site plan, written and graphic depiction of the project's biological mitigation/monitoring program, and a schedule. The BCME shall be approved by MMC and referenced in the construction documents.
- E. Avian Protection Requirements To avoid any direct impacts to raptors and/or candidate, sensitive, or special status species in the MSCP, removal of habitat that supports active nests in the proposed area of disturbance should occur outside of the breeding season for these species (February 1 to September 15). If removal of habitat in the proposed area of disturbance must occur during the breeding season, the Qualified Biologist shall conduct a pre-construction survey to determine the presence or absence of nesting birds on the proposed area of disturbance. The pre-construction survey shall be conducted within 10 calendar days prior to the start of construction activities (including removal of vegetation). The applicant shall submit the results of the pre-construction survey to City DSD for review and approval prior to initiating any construction activities. If nesting birds are detected, a letter report or mitigation plan in conformance with the City's Biology Guidelines and applicable state and federal law (i.e., appropriate follow up surveys, monitoring schedules, construction and noise barriers/buffers, etc.) shall be prepared and include proposed measures to be implemented to ensure that take of birds or eggs or disturbance of breeding activities is avoided. The report or mitigation plan shall be submitted to the City for review and approval and implemented to the satisfaction of the City. The City's MMC Section and Biologist shall verify and approve that all measures identified in the report or mitigation plan are in place prior to and/or during construction.
- F. **Resource Delineation** Prior to construction activities, the Qualified Biologist shall supervise the placement of orange construction fencing or equivalent along the limits of disturbance adjacent to sensitive biological habitats and verify compliance with any other project conditions as shown on the BCME. This phase shall include flagging plant specimens

and delimiting buffers to protect sensitive biological resources (e.g., habitats/flora & fauna species, including nesting birds) during construction. Appropriate steps/care should be taken to minimize attraction of nest predators to the site.

G. **Education** - Prior to commencement of construction activities, the Qualified Biologist shall meet with the owner/permittee or designee and the construction crew and conduct an onsite educational session regarding the need to avoid impacts outside of the approved construction area and to protect sensitive flora and fauna (e.g., explain the avian and wetland buffers, flag system for removal of invasive species or retention of sensitive plants, and clarify acceptable access routes/methods and staging areas, etc.).

#### II. During Construction

- A. Monitoring All construction (including access/staging areas) shall be restricted to areas previously identified, proposed for development/staging, or previously disturbed as shown on "Exhibit A" and/or the BCME. The Qualified Biologist shall monitor construction activities as needed to ensure that construction activities do not encroach into biologically sensitive areas, or cause other similar damage, and that the work plan has been amended to accommodate any sensitive species located during the pre-construction surveys. In addition, the Qualified Biologist shall document field activity via the Consultant Site Visit Record (CSVR). The CSVR shall be e-mailed to MMC on the 1<sup>st</sup> day of monitoring, the 1<sup>st</sup> week of each month, the last day of monitoring, and immediately in the case of any undocumented condition or discovery.
- B. **Subsequent Resource Identification** The Qualified Biologist shall note/act to prevent any new disturbances to habitat, flora, and/or fauna onsite (e.g., flag plant specimens for avoidance during access, etc.). If active nests or other previously unknown sensitive resources are detected, all project activities that directly impact the resource shall be delayed until species specific local, state or federal regulations have been determined and applied by the Qualified Biologist.

#### III. Post Construction Measures

A. In the event that impacts exceed previously allowed amounts, additional impacts shall be mitigated in accordance with City Biology Guidelines, ESL and MSCP, State CEQA, and other applicable local, state and federal law. The Qualified Biologist shall submit a final BCME/report to the satisfaction of the City ADD/MMC within 30 days of construction completion.

# 4.3.3.4 Significance of Impacts after Mitigation

Direct impacts to raptors and migratory birds would be mitigated to below a level of significance by measures BIO-1 and BIO-2 because project requirements would ensure construction-related activities would not disrupt the breeding and/or nesting of these birds.

# 4.3.4 Issue 2: Sensitive Habitats

Would the project result in a substantial adverse impact on any Tier I Habitats, Tier II Habitats, Tier IIIA Habitats, or Tier IIIB Habitats as identified in the Biology Guidelines of the LDC or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the CDFW or USFWS?

# 4.3.4.1 Impacts

The project would impact a maximum of 20.83 acres of the 58.43-acre (including the off-site improvements) project site (Figure 4.3-2). Table 4.3-2 summarizes the impacts to each vegetation community/land cover type through grading and development. Brush management zone 2 areas are considered impact neutral (not considered an impact and cannot contribute towards mitigation), and are not included in the table.

Imp	Table 4.3-2 Impacts to Vegetation Communities/Land Cover Types within the Corrected MHPA												
					Off	-site							
			Projec	Project Area Improvement Area									
			Impacts	Impacts	Impacts	Impacts							
Habitat Types			Inside	Outside	Inside	Outside	Total						
(City of San Diego	MSCP	Existing	MHPA	MHPA	MHPA	MHPA	Impacts						
2012)	Tier	Acreage	(acres)	(acres)	(acres)	(acres)	(acres) <sup>1</sup>						
Coastal Sage Scrub		8.74	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00						
Non-Native Grassland	III-B	4.25	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00						
Eucalyptus Woodland	IV	5.34	0.00	0.13	0.00	0.00	0.13						
Urban/Developed	-	40.10	0.00	20.48	0.00	0.22	20.70						
TOTAL		58.43	0.00	20.61	0.00	0.22	20.83						
<sup>1</sup> Acreage does not include occurring outside of the de neutral and do not contrib	evelopme	nt footprint	. Zone 2 mair										

Impacts to eucalyptus woodland (Tier IV) and urban/developed would not be considered significant as these vegetation communities are not considered sensitive by the City of San Diego and, therefore, would not require mitigation (City of San Diego 2012). Though not mitigation, the remaining 18.20 acres of habitat within the project site outside of the limits of disturbance would be placed in a covenant of easement (Figure 4.3-3). The covenant of easement would contain 8.74 acres of Diegan coastal sage scrub, 4.25 acres of non-native grassland, and 5.21 acres of eucalyptus woodland, and would include all habitats to be preserved within the MHPA, as discussed in Section 4.1.5.





Project Site

Off-site Improvement Area

Limits of Disturbance

Brush Management Zone 2

Corrected MHPA Boundary

General Note: This biology report pertains only to the sitework and building improvements within the Limits of Disturbance that are subject to site development permit review. Refer to page A1.A01A of the Campus Point Site Development Permit for permit and PTS numbers

M:\JOBS3\5230\common\_gis\fig4.3-2.mxd 6/30/2016 ccn

#### **Vegetation Communities**

Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub Eucalyptus Woodland Non-Native Grassland Urban\Developed

**FIGURE 4.3-2** Impacts to Vegetation Communities/Land Cover Types





Urban\Developed

**FIGURE 4.3-3 Covenant of Easement** 

Covenant of Easement

Corrected MHPA Boundary

# 4.3.4.2 Significance of Impacts

The project would not impact any sensitive vegetation communities (Tier II or III-B). As the project would not impact sensitive vegetation communities, impacts to sensitive vegetation communities would be less than significant.

# 4.3.4.3 Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting

No significant impacts to sensitive vegetation communities would occur; therefore, no mitigation is required.

# 4.3.5 Issue 3: Wetlands

Would the project result in a substantial adverse impact on wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, riparian, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

# 4.3.5.1 Impacts

No wetlands exist within the project site. Therefore, no direct impacts to wetlands would occur from the implementation of the project. Indirect impacts to the riparian habitat off-site are not anticipated as the riparian habitat is approximately 450 feet southeast and downslope of the impact area and project activities would conform to MHPA Land Use Adjacency Guidelines. Therefore, direct and indirect impacts to wetlands would be less than significant.

# 4.3.5.2 Significance of Impacts

No direct impacts would result from the project as no wetlands exist within the project site. Indirect impacts to the riparian habitat off-site would be less than significant.

# 4.3.5.3 Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting

No impacts to wetlands would occur; therefore, no mitigation is required.

# 4.3.6 Issue 4: Wildlife Movement Corridors

Would the proposal interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, including linkages identified in the MSCP, or impede the use of native wildlife nurseries?

# 4.3.6.1 Impacts

As discussed above in Section 4.3.1.5, Wildlife Movement Corridors, the project site does not provide a regional throughway for wildlife species and, therefore, does not function as a significant regional corridor. The project would be contiguous with the existing development and, therefore, would not
interfere substantially with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, including designated linkages identified in the MSCP, or impede the use of native wildlife nurseries. Therefore, impacts to wildlife movement would be less than significant.

## 4.3.6.2 Significance of Impacts

Impacts associated with the substantial interference of a wildlife movement corridor would be less than significant.

#### 4.3.6.3 Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting

No impacts regarding wildlife movement would occur; therefore, no mitigation is required.

# 4.3.7 Issue 5: Habitat Conservation Plans

Would the project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan, either within the MSCP plan area or in the surrounding region?

#### 4.3.7.1 Impacts

The project site lies within the boundaries of the City of San Diego's MSCP Subarea Plan. MHPA lands are those that have been included within the City of San Diego's MSCP Subarea Plan for habitat conservation. These lands have been determined to provide the necessary habitat quality, quantity, and connectivity to sustain the unique biodiversity of the San Diego region. MHPA is mapped onsite; more specifically within and adjacent to the northeastern and southeastern portion of the project site.

Due to the presence of the MHPA, on and adjacent to the site, the project would be required to comply with the MHPA Land Use Adjacency Guidelines, as stated in Section 1.4.3 of the City of San Diego's Subarea Plan, in order to ensure that the project would not result in any indirect impacts to the MHPA. Per the MSCP, potential indirect effects from drainage, lighting, noise, barriers, invasives, and brush management from project construction and operation must not adversely affect the MHPA. Refer to Section 4.1, Land Use for further details.

The project as designed would not be in conflict with an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan, including the MSCP. As described in Section 4.1.6.1, no direct impacts or loss of MHPA lands would result from the project. As described in Section 4.1, Land Use, indirect impacts as a result of MHPA adjacency would be avoided through project compliance with the MHPA Land Use Adjacency Guidelines which are included in this document as mitigation measure LU-1. Therefore, impacts would not result.

## 4.3.7.2 Significance of Impacts

As described in Section 4.1.6.1, the project would not be in conflict with an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan, including the MSCP. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

## 4.3.7.3 Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting

As described in Section 4.1.6.1, impacts would be less than significant upon implementation of and compliance with the Land Use Adjacency Guidelines (mitigation measure LU-1).

# 4.3.8 Issue 6: MHPA Land Use Adjacency

Would the project result in introducing a land use within an area adjacent to the MHPA that would result in adverse edge effects?

#### 4.3.8.1 Impacts

The MHPA has been designed to maximize conservation of sensitive biological resources, including sensitive species. The land use adjacency guidelines have been developed to avoid indirect impacts, or edge effects, resulting from either construction or operational activities that may degrade the habitat value or disrupt animals within the preserve area when land is developed adjacent to the MHPA. As discussed in Section 4.1, Land Use, the project would be in compliance with the MHPA Land Use Adjacency Guidelines, included as LU-1, which would ensure that indirect impacts are less than significant.

#### 4.3.8.2 Significance of Impacts

As discussed in Section 4.1, Land Use, impacts to the MHPA as a result of edge effects would be avoided through implementation of the Land Use Adjacency Guidelines (LU-1). Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

#### 4.3.8.3 Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting

The project would implement mitigation measure LU-1 (the Land Use Adjacency Guidelines); thereby ensuring that impacts would be less than significant.

# 4.3.9 Issue 7: Local Policies and Ordinances

Would the project result in a conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources?

#### 4.3.9.1 Impacts

As discussed in Land Use Section 4.1.5, LDC Compliance, and 4.1.6, MSCP/MHPA Compliance, the project would be consistent with the MSCP, ESL, and the City's Biology Guidelines. Therefore, no significant impacts related to local policies or ordinances would result from the project.

## 4.3.9.2 Significance of Impacts

Impacts related to local policies or ordinances would be less than significant.

#### 4.3.9.3 Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting

No significant impacts related to local policies or ordinances would occur; therefore, no mitigation is required.

# 4.3.10 Issue 8: Invasive Species

Would the project result in the introduction of invasive species of plants into a natural open space area?

#### 4.3.10.1 Impacts

Invasive species are aggressive non-native plant species that threaten natural habitats by outcompeting native species and reducing biodiversity. These plants thrive in areas disturbed by activities such as grading, construction, and off-road-vehicle use or fire.

No invasive plant species would be introduced into a natural open space area. The project includes a conceptual landscape plan, which is incorporated into the project design to ensure that indirect effects due to invasive species would not occur. The plan provides a list of plant materials that would respond to a variety of locations, orientations, levels of refinement, and land use transitions and edge conditions. The conceptual landscape plan was prepared in accordance with established guidelines and the final plan would be in substantial conformance to conceptual plan.

Due to the project site's adjacency to the MHPA, the project would be required to comply with the MHPA Land Use Adjacency Guidelines with respect to invasive species, as stated in Section 4.1, Land Use. Therefore, the planting palette for the project shall not include any invasive or non-native plant species adjacent to the MHPA. The following species will be planted directly adjacent to the MHPA: dwarf coyote brush (*Baccharis pilularis 'Twin Peaks'*), California poppy (*Eschscholzia californica*), deer grass (*Muhlenbergia rigens*), San Diego sunflower (*Bahiopsis laciniata*), and our Lord's candle (*Hesperoyucca whipplei*).

Additionally, existing invasive species shall be removed from the premises to the maximum extent practicable from the MHPA or within 100 feet. Invasive species to be removed from the MHPA or within 100 feet include (but are not limited to) pampas grass, common poison hemlock, Russian thistle, Cootamundra wattle, western coastal wattle, Italian thistle, tree tobacco, scarlet pimpernel, English plantain, Australian saltbush, Peruvian pepper, and tocalote. Removal of small non-native annuals (e.g., tocalote and scarlet pimpernel) occurring within native habitats (e.g., coastal sage scrub) shall not be performed in such a way as to impact native flora and fauna. Eucalyptus planted within the MHPA prior to the adoption of the MSCP will not be removed. As such, impacts related to the introduction of invasive plant species would be less than significant.

## 4.3.10.2 Significance of Impacts

The project would not introduce invasive species into a natural open space area; therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

#### 4.3.10.3 Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting

No significant impacts resulting from invasive plants would occur; therefore, no mitigation would be required.

# 4.3.11 Comparison to the 1993 EIR

The 1993 FEIR concluded that while the site was found to contain native vegetation, including coastal sage scrub, along the northern, northeastern, and eastern edges, the proposed development would be limited to the already graded portions of the site. Further, the 1993 FEIR states that "open space easements or non-building easements are shown on the vesting tentative map (VTM) over surrounding slopes including all areas of native vegetation with the exception of a small patch immediately north of IVAC. This area would be included in a negative open space easement as a condition of the VTM." Thus, the 1993 EIR concluded that there would be no significant impacts associated with the project.

Implementation of the proposed project would not increase the severity of impacts associated with biological resources nor change the conclusions reached by the analysis in the 1993 FEIR. However, this SEIR does address changes that have occurred since the 1993 FEIR was certified with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken. These changes are associated with the fact that the City adopted the MSCP Subarea Plan in March 1997 with the goal of conserving sensitive biological resources while allowing for reasonable economic growth. In accordance with the MSCP, non-native grassland is considered a sensitive habitat as it provides foraging area for many species, and is especially valuable for raptors as hunting grounds. In addition, there is a potential for raptors and migratory birds to nest on-site due to the presence of large eucalyptus trees as well as suitable Diegan coastal sage scrub and non-native grassland habitat. Therefore, pursuant to the California Fish and Game Code 3503 and the MBTA, measures must be taken to ensure that there are no "takings" of bird nests or eggs. As addressed above, impacts to biological resources (i.e., raptors and migratory birds) would be mitigated to less than significant through the implementation of mitigation measures BIO-1 and BIO-2.

# 4.4 Historical Resources

This section addresses the potential for project activities to disturb prehistoric/historic resources as well as religious or sacred uses within the project site. The 1993 FEIR addressed cultural resources in Chapter 5, Effects Not Found to be Significant. The discussion in Section 5.2 of the 1993 FEIR states that no resources were detected on-site during the 1991 survey and the archaeological team found no traces of the site CA-SDI-5613/W-1668 which was discovered during a 1978 survey of the much larger 194-acre Campus Point. The 1993 FEIR states that the CA-SDI-5613 site was salvaged in 1978 and the remnants were subsequently graded and eliminated. The possibility of buried significant historical resources or features is considered low due to the past construction.

However, the past excavations included burials and hearths, and features such as these may still exist within undisturbed pockets of cultural deposits. Further, grading may be deeper than it was in the past, and may result in impacting any remaining cultural deposits. For this reason, RECON conducted historical resource surveys of the project site in March 2013 and November 2015 in order to be able update the 1993 FEIR with respect to cultural resources. The surveys consisted of a review of all relevant site records and reports on file, as well as an intensive on-foot survey of the project site. The historical resources reports are summarized below, and included as Appendix E. In addition, the City adopted Historical Resource Guidelines in 2001 and these guidelines are used in this SEIR analysis.

# 4.4.1 Existing Conditions

#### 4.4.1.1 Known Prehistoric/Historic Resources

#### a. Cultural Setting

The prehistoric cultural sequence in San Diego County is generally conceived as comprising three basic periods: the Paleoindian, dated between about 11,500 and 8,500 years ago and manifested by the artifacts of the San Dieguito Complex; the Archaic, lasting from about 8,500 to 1,500 years ago (A.D. 500) and manifested by the cobble and core technology of the La Jollan Complex; and the Late Prehistoric, lasting from about 1,500 years ago to historic contact (i.e., A.D. 500 to 1769) and represented by the Cuyamaca Complex. This latest complex is marked by the appearance of ceramics, small arrow points, and cremation burial practices.

The Paleoindian Period in San Diego County is most closely associated with the San Dieguito Complex, as identified by Rogers (1938, 1939, 1945). The San Dieguito assemblage consists of wellmade scraper planes, choppers, scraping tools, crescentics, elongated bifacial knives, and leafshaped points. The San Dieguito Complex is thought to represent an early emphasis on hunting (Warren et al. 1993:III-33). The Archaic Period brings an apparent shift toward a more generalized economy and an increased emphasis on seed resources, small game, and shellfish. The local cultural manifestations of the Archaic Period are called the La Jollan Complex along the coast and the Pauma Complex inland. Pauma Complex sites lack the shell that dominates many La Jollan sites. Along with an economic focus on gathering plant resources, the settlement system appears to have been more sedentary. The La Jollan assemblage is dominated by rough cobble-based choppers and scrapers, and slab and basin metates. Large side-notched and Elko series projectile points appeared. Large deposits of marine shell at coastal sites argue for the importance of shellfish gathering to the coastal Archaic economy.

Near the coast and in the Peninsular Mountains beginning approximately 1,500 years ago, patterns began to emerge which suggest the ethnohistoric Kumeyaay. This period is characterized by higher population densities and elaborations in social, political, and technological systems. Economic systems diversify and intensify during this period, with the continued elaboration of trade networks, the use of shell-bead currency, and the appearance of more labor-intensive, but effective technological innovations. The late prehistoric archaeology of the San Diego coast and foothills is characterized by the Cuyamaca Complex. It is primarily known from the work of D. L. True at Cuyamaca Rancho State Park (True 1970). The Cuyamaca Complex is characterized by the presence of steatite arrowshaft straighteners, steatite pendants, steatite comales (heating stones), Tizon Brownware pottery, ceramic figurines reminiscent of Hohokam styles, ceramic "Yuman bow pipes," ceramic rattles, miniature pottery various cobble-based tools (e.g., scrapers, choppers, hammerstones), bone awls, manos and metates, mortars and pestles, and Desert side-notched (more common) and Cottonwood Series projectile points.

The Kumeyaay (also known as Kamia, Ipai, Tipai, and Diegueño) occupied the southern two-thirds of San Diego County. The Kumeyaay lived in semi-sedentary, politically autonomous villages or rancherias. Settlement system typically consisted of two or more seasonal villages with temporary camps radiating away from these central places (Cline 1984a and 1984b). Their economic system consisted of hunting and gathering with a focus on small game, acorns, grass seeds, and other plant resources. The most basic social and economic unit was the patrilocal extended family. A wide range of tools were made of locally available and imported materials. A simple shoulder-height bow was used for hunting. Numerous other flaked stone tools were made including scrapers, choppers, flakebased cutting tools, and biface knives. Preferred stone types were locally available metavolcanics, cherts, and quartz. Obsidian was imported from the deserts to the north and east. Ground stone objects include mortars and pestles typically made of locally available, fine-grained granite. Both portable and bedrock types are known. The Kumeyaay made fine baskets. These employed either coiled or twined construction. The Kumeyaay also made pottery, using the paddle-and-anvil technique. Most were a plain brown utility ware called Tizon Brownware, but some were decorated (Meighan 1954; May 1976, 1978).

The Spanish Period (1769–1821) represents a time of European exploration and settlement. Military and naval forces along with a religious contingent founded the San Diego Presidio, the pueblo of San Diego, and the San Diego Mission in 1769 (Rolle 1998). Native American culture in the coastal strip of California rapidly deteriorated despite repeated attempts to revolt against the Spanish invaders (Cook 1976). One of the hallmarks of the Spanish colonial scheme was the rancho system. In an

attempt to encourage settlement and development of the colonies, large land grants were made to meritorious or well-connected individuals.

In 1821, Mexico declared its independence from Spain. During the Mexican Period (1822–1848), the mission system was secularized by the Mexican government, and these lands allowed for the dramatic expansion of the rancho system. The southern California economy became increasingly based on cattle ranching.

The Mexican Period ended when Mexico signed the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo on February 2, 1848, concluding the Mexican–American War (1846–1848; Rolle 1998). By the late 1800s, the population in San Diego County more than tripled (Pourade 1963). Development in the county was well under way with the beginnings of a recognizable downtown San Diego area and the gradual development of a number of outlying communities, many of which were established around previously defined ranchos and land grants. The American homestead system encouraged settlement beyond the coastal plain into areas where Native Americans had retreated to avoid the worst of Spanish and Mexican influences (Carrico 1987; Cook 1976). A rural community cultural pattern existed in San Diego County from approximately 1870 to 1930. These communities were composed of an aggregate of people who lived within well-defined geographic boundaries, on farmsteads tied together through a common school district, church, post office, and country store (Hector and Van Wormer 1986).

#### **b.** Records Search

Record searches were conducted in February 2013 through the California Historical Resources Information System, South Coastal Information Center (SCIC) at San Diego State University in order to determine if previously recorded prehistoric or historic cultural resources occur on the project site. Historic aerial photographs were also checked for past development within and near the project site.

The record searches indicate one previously recorded prehistoric cultural resource, CA-SDI-5613, is present within the project site. CA-SDI-5613 was first recorded in 1978 as midden soil with a shell and lithic scatter containing artifacts consisting of flakes, scrapers, and choppers that had been disturbed by plowing, grazing, and dirt roads (Bull and Hanna 1978). Testing and data recovery excavations were completed at CA-SDI-5613 Locus A in 1979 by RECON. The artifacts recovered included debitage, cores, flaked lithic artifacts, manos, metates, shellfish remains, and fire-affected rock, and indicated that the site was occupied during the Archaic Period. Additional work was completed at Locus B of CA-SDI-5613 by ASM Affiliates in 1998 and a test and evaluation program in 1999. The site area of CA-SDI-5613 has been impacted by the previous construction of the existing building and parking lots.

The 1953, 1964, and 1966 historic aerial photographs show dirt roads within the project area. In the 1980 aerial photograph, the entire project property has been graded and the northern parking lots and building were under construction. The area where the existing garden is had also been cleared and graded. The 1981 aerial photograph displays the existing parking lots and building as being completed. The area where the garden currently exists was cleared and may have been used as a staging area during construction. This garden area was covered by vegetation, most likely grasses, in

the 1990, 2003, and 2005 aerial photographs (Nationwide Environmental Title Research 2013). The 10290 Campus Point Drive parcel remained undeveloped up until at least 1996. The 2002 aerial photograph shows the existing building and parking lots constructed.

The Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) files do not indicate the presence of Native American cultural resources in the immediate project area of potential effect (APE). The NAHC recommended that local governments contact local Native American tribes to determine if any cultural places are located within the APE. No comments have been received as of the writing of this document.

#### c. Field Inspection

The 2013 survey relocated CA-SDI-5613 in an area outside the APE. Five flakes and one scraper were identified within the southern locus in an area of erosion clear of vegetation and topsoil. The portion of the site within the APE was covered by asphalt at the time of the survey, and was not examined.

The majority of the northwestern survey area is a steep, man-made, cut-and-fill slope. Low grasses dominate this area, with a eucalyptus grove located in the southern part. These areas were not surveyed, since no cultural resources would be expected on fill soil. The northeastern part of the northwestern survey area appeared not to have been disturbed, and contained sage brush with about 30 percent visibility.

The 2015 survey of the 10290 Campus Point Drive parcel found no historical resources as no known historic structures has ever been built on the site, only recent buildings. The majority of the parcel was covered by asphalt parking lots and the existing multi-story building. The western end of the parcel is a partially man-made slope too steep to have been utilized by Native American groups.

# 4.4.2 Significance Determination Thresholds

#### 4.4.2.1 Evaluation of Cultural Resource Significance

Federal, state, and local criteria are used to evaluate the significance of a prehistoric or historic resource.

Federal criteria are those used to determine eligibility for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). These criteria state that the quality of significance in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, and culture is present in districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling and association, and:

- A. Are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or
- B. Are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or

- C. Embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction; or that represent the work of a master; or that possess high artistic values; or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or
- D. Have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

State criteria are those listed in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and used to determine whether a historic resource qualifies for the California Register of Historic Resources (CRHR). According to the CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.9 and Appendix G, adoption and implementation of the project would result in a significant adverse cultural resources impact if the project would:

- A. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical architectural resource that is listed on, or determined to be eligible for listing on, the NRHP or the CRHR; is listed on or determined to be eligible for listing on the San Diego List of Historic Sites; or that meets any of the following criteria:
  - Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of history at the local, regional, state, or national level;
  - Is associated with the lives of significant persons in the past on a local, regional, state or national level;
  - Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values; or
  - Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in history or prehistory; or
- B. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an important archaeological resource or disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

City criteria include all properties (historic, archaeological, landscapes, traditional, etc.) that are eligible or potentially eligible for the NRHP; those properties that may be significant under state and local laws and registration programs, such as the CRHR and the City Historical Resources Register. Any improvement, building, structure, sign, interior element and fixture, site, place, district, area or object may be designated as historic by the City Historical Resources Board if it meets any of the following criteria:

- A. Exemplifies or reflects special elements of the City's, a community's, or a neighborhood's historical, archaeological, cultural, social, economic, political, aesthetic, engineering, landscaping, or architectural development;
- B. Is identified with persons or events significant in local, state, or national history;
- C. Embodies distinctive characteristics of a style, type, period, or method of construction or is a valuable example of the use of indigenous materials or craftsmanship;

- D. Is representative of the notable work of a master builder, designer, architect, engineer, landscape architect, interior designer, artist, or craftsman;
- E. Is listed on or has been determined eligible by the National Park Service for listing on the NRHP or is listed or has been determined eligible by the California Office of Historic Preservation for listing on the State Register of Historical Resources; or
- F. Is a finite group of resources related to one another in a clearly distinguishable way; or is a geographically definable area or neighborhood containing improvements which have a special character, historical interest or aesthetic value; or which represent one or more architectural periods or styles in the history and development of the City.

If a resource is not listed in, or determined eligible for listing in, the California Register, not included in a local register, or not deemed significant in a historical resource survey, City criteria states that it may nonetheless be historically significant. The significance of a historical resource in this case would be based on the potential for the resource to meet one or more of the criteria presented above, including the potential to address important research questions as documented in a sitespecific technical report.

As a baseline, the City has established the following criteria to be used in the determination of significance under CEQA.

• An archaeological site must consist of at least three associated artifacts/ecofacts (within a 40-square-meter area) or a single feature. Archaeological sites containing only a surface component are generally considered not significant, unless otherwise demonstrated. Testing is required to document the absence of subsurface deposit. The determination of significance is based on a number of factors specific to a particular site, including site size, type, and integrity; presence or absence of a subsurface deposit, soil stratigraphy, features, diagnostics, and datable material; artifact and ecofact density; assemblage complexity; cultural affiliation; association with an important person or event; and ethnic importance.

#### 4.4.2.2 Determination of Impact Significance

Based on the City's 2011 Significance Determination Thresholds, impacts related to historical resources would be significant if the project would:

- 1. Result in the alteration, including the adverse physical or aesthetic effects and/or destruction of a prehistoric or historic building (including an architecturally significant building), structure, object, or site;
- 2. Result in any impact to existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area; or
- 3. Result in the disturbance on any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

# 4.4.3 Issue 1: Prehistoric/Historic Resources

Would the project result in the alteration, including the adverse physical or aesthetic effects and/or the destruction of a prehistoric or historic building (including an architecturally significant building), structure, or object or site?

#### 4.4.3.1 Impacts

During the survey, the midden site (CA-SDI-5613) was found to be within the project site east of Campus Point Drive. Because CA-SDI-5613 was outside the project's APE, its cultural value would not be impacted by the project. Independently of this registered resource, five flakes and one scraper were identified within the southern locus as mapped by SCIC in an area of erosion clear of vegetation and topsoil. Because these artifacts were found on the surface, having eroded out of the soil, they do not meet the City's criteria for culturally significant resources.

The existing buildings on the project site are less than 45 years old and are not significant historical resources under either CEQA or City of San Diego criteria. The possibility of significant subsurface historical resources being present is considered very low, as the majority of the property has been heavily impacted by previous grading.

In the southern portion of the east side of Campus Point Drive there is an existing trail where construction debris has been dumped. The majority of the western survey area is a steep, manmade, cut-and-fill slope; thus, the cultural value of this area has already been compromised. However, if grading for the project is deeper than it was in the past, there is potential for significant subsurface cultural deposits throughout the project site. If present, these subsurface objects would be expected to be similar to those found during past excavations.

#### 4.4.3.2 Significance of Impacts

The field survey found cultural material within the survey area, but outside the project's APE. Impacts to the identified resources would be less than significant because CA-SDI-5613 is no longer culturally significant, and the artifacts found do not meet the criteria for cultural significance. However, there is potential for significant subsurface cultural deposits to be uncovered and destroyed during grading, thereby resulting in a significant impact.

#### 4.4.3.3 Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting

**HIST-1:** The following condition of approval shall be applied to the project:

#### I. Prior to Permit Issuance

- A. Entitlements Plan Check
  - 1. Prior to issuance of any construction permits, including but not limited to, the first Grading Permit, Demolition Plans/Permits and Building Plans/Permits or a Notice to Proceed for Subdivisions, but prior to the first preconstruction meeting, whichever is

applicable, the Assistant Deputy Director (ADD) Environmental designee shall verify that the requirements for Archaeological Monitoring and Native American monitoring have been noted on the applicable construction documents through the plan check process.

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

#### II. Prior to Start of Construction

- A. Verification of Records Search
  - The PI shall provide verification to MMC that a site specific records search (¼-mile radius) has been completed. Verification includes, but is not limited to a copy of a confirmation letter from South Coastal Information Center, or, if the search was in-house, a letter of verification from the PI stating that the search was completed.
  - 2. The letter shall introduce any pertinent information concerning expectations and probabilities of discovery during trenching and/or grading activities.
  - 3. The PI may submit a detailed letter to MMC requesting a reduction to the ¼-mile radius.
- B. PI Shall Attend Precon Meetings
  - Prior to beginning any work that requires monitoring; the Applicant shall arrange a Precon Meeting that shall include the PI, Native American consultant/monitor (where Native American resources may be impacted), Construction Manager (CM) and/or Grading Contractor, Resident Engineer (RE), Building Inspector (BI), if appropriate, and MMC. The qualified Archaeologist and Native American Monitor shall attend any grading/excavation related precon meetings to make comments and/or suggestions concerning the archaeological monitoring program with the CM and/or Grading Contractor.
    - a. If the PI is unable to attend the precon meeting, the Applicant shall schedule a focused Precon Meeting with MMC, the PI, RE, CM or BI, if appropriate, prior to the start of any work that requires monitoring.

- 2. Identify Areas to be Monitored
  - a. Prior to the start of any work that requires monitoring, the PI shall submit an Archaeological Monitoring Exhibit (AME) (with verification that the AME has been reviewed and approved by the Native American consultant/monitor when Native American resources may be impacted) based on the appropriate construction documents (reduced to 11x17) to MMC identifying the areas to be monitored including the delineation of grading/excavation limits.
  - b. The AME shall be based on the results of a site specific records search as well as information regarding existing known soil conditions (native or formation.
- 3. When Monitoring Will Occur
  - a. Prior to the start of any work, the PI shall also submit a construction schedule to MMC through the RE indicating when and where monitoring will occur.
  - b. The PI may submit a detailed letter to MMC prior to the start of work or during construction requesting a modification to the monitoring program. This request shall be based on relevant information such as review of final construction documents which indicate site conditions such as depth of excavation and/or site graded to bedrock, etc., which may reduce or increase the potential for resources to be present.

#### III. During Construction

- A. Monitor(s) Shall be Present During Grading/Excavation/Trenching
  - The Archaeological Monitor shall be present full-time during all soil disturbing and grading/excavation/trenching activities which could result in impacts to archaeological resources as identified on the AME. The CM is responsible for notifying the RE, PI, and MMC of changes to any construction activities such as in the case of a potential safety concern within the area being monitored. In certain circumstances Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) safety requirements may necessitate modification of the AME.
  - 2. The Native American consultant/monitor shall determine the extent of their presence during soil disturbing and grading/excavation/trenching activities based on the AME and provide that information to the PI and MMC. If prehistoric resources are encountered during the Native American consultant/monitor's absence, work shall stop and the Discovery Notification Process detailed in Section III.B–C and IV.A–D shall commence.
  - 3. The PI may submit a detailed letter to MMC during construction requesting a modification to the monitoring program when a field condition such as modern disturbance post-dating the previous grading/trenching activities, presence of fossil formations, or when native soils are encountered that may reduce or increase the potential for resources to be present.

- 4. The archaeological and Native American consultant/monitor shall document field activity via the Consultant Site Visit Record (CSVR). The CSVRs shall be faxed by the CM to the RE the first day of monitoring, the last day of monitoring, monthly (**Notification of Monitoring Completion**), and in the case of ANY discoveries. The RE shall forward copies to MMC.
- B. Discovery Notification Process
  - In the event of a discovery, the Archaeological Monitor shall direct the contractor to temporarily divert all soil disturbing activities, including but not limited to digging, trenching, excavating or grading activities in the area of discovery and in the area reasonably suspected to overlay adjacent resources and immediately notify the RE or BI, as appropriate.
  - 2. The Monitor shall immediately notify the PI (unless Monitor is the PI) of the discovery.
  - 3. The PI shall immediately notify MMC by phone of the discovery, and shall also submit written documentation to MMC within 24 hours by fax or email with photos of the resource in context, if possible.
  - 4. No soil shall be exported off-site until a determination can be made regarding the significance of the resource specifically if Native American resources are encountered.
- C. Determination of Significance
  - 1. The PI and Native American consultant/monitor, where Native American resources are discovered shall evaluate the significance of the resource. If human remains are involved, follow protocol in Section IV below.
    - a. The PI shall immediately notify MMC by phone to discuss significance determination and shall also submit a letter to MMC indicating whether additional mitigation is required.
    - b. If the resource is significant, the PI shall submit an Archaeological Data Recovery Program (ADRP) which has been reviewed by the Native American consultant/monitor, and obtain written approval from MMC. Impacts to significant resources must be mitigated before ground disturbing activities in the area of discovery will be allowed to resume. Note: If a unique archaeological site is also an historical resource as defined in CEQA, then the limits on the amount(s) that a project applicant may be required to pay to cover mitigation costs as indicated in CEQA Section 21083.2 shall not apply.
    - c. If the resource is not significant, the PI shall submit a letter to MMC indicating that artifacts will be collected, curated, and documented in the Final Monitoring Report. The letter shall also indicate that that no further work is required.

#### **IV.** Discovery of Human Remains

If human remains are discovered, work shall halt in that area and no soil shall be exported off-site until a determination can be made regarding the provenance of the human remains; and the following procedures as set forth in CEQA Section 15064.9(e), the California Public Resources Code (Section 5097.98) and State Health and Safety Code (Section 7050.5) shall be undertaken:

- A. Notification
  - 1. Archaeological Monitor shall notify the RE or BI as appropriate, MMC, and the PI, if the Monitor is not qualified as a PI. MMC will notify the appropriate Senior Planner in the Environmental Analysis Section (EAS) of the Development Services Department to assist with the discovery notification process.
  - 2. The PI shall notify the Medical Examiner after consultation with the RE, either in person or via telephone.
- B. Isolate discovery site
  - 1. Work shall be directed away from the location of the discovery and any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlay adjacent human remains until a determination can be made by the Medical Examiner in consultation with the PI concerning the provenance of the remains.
  - 2. The Medical Examiner, in consultation with the PI, will determine the need for a field examination to determine the provenance.
  - 3. If a field examination is not warranted, the Medical Examiner will determine with input from the PI, if the remains are or are most likely to be of Native American origin.
- C. If Human Remains **ARE** determined to be Native American
  - 1. The Medical Examiner will notify the NAHC within 24 hours. By law, **ONLY** the Medical Examiner can make this call.
  - 2. NAHC will immediately identify the person or persons determined to be the Most Likely Descendent (MLD) and provide contact information.
  - 3. The MLD will contact the PI within 24 hours or sooner after the Medical Examiner has completed coordination, to begin the consultation process in accordance with CEQA Section 15064.9(e), the California Public Resources and Health & Safety Codes.
  - 4. The MLD will have 48 hours to make recommendations to the property owner or representative, for the treatment or disposition with proper dignity, of the human remains and associated grave goods.
  - 5. Disposition of Native American human remains will be determined between the MLD and the PI, and, if:

- a. The NAHC is unable to identify the MLD, OR the MLD failed to make a recommendation within 48 hours after being notified by the Commission; OR
- b. The landowner or authorized representative rejects the recommendation of the MLD and mediation in accordance with Public Resources Code (PRC) 5097.94 (k) by the NAHC fails to provide measures acceptable to the landowner; THEN
- c. In order to protect these sites, the Landowner shall do one or more of the following:
  - (1) Record the site with the NAHC;
  - (2) Record an open space or conservation easement on the site;
  - (3) Record a document with the County.
- d. Upon the discovery of multiple Native American human remains during a ground disturbing land development activity, the landowner may agree that additional conferral with descendants is necessary to consider culturally appropriate treatment of multiple Native American human remains. Culturally appropriate treatment of such a discovery may be ascertained from review of the site utilizing cultural and archaeological standards. Where the parties are unable to agree on the appropriate treatment measures the human remains and buried with Native American human remains shall be reinterred with appropriate dignity, pursuant to Section 5.c., above.
- D. If Human Remains are **NOT** Native American
  - 1. The PI shall contact the Medical Examiner and notify them of the historic era context of the burial.
  - 2. The Medical Examiner will determine the appropriate course of action with the PI and City staff (PRC 5097.98).
  - 3. If the remains are of historic origin, they shall be appropriately removed and conveyed to the San Diego Museum of Man for analysis. The decision for internment of the human remains shall be made in consultation with MMC, EAS, the applicant/landowner, any known descendant group, and the San Diego Museum of Man.

#### V. Night and/or Weekend Work

- A. If night and/or weekend work is included in the contract
  - 1. When night and/or weekend work is included in the contract package, the extent and timing shall be presented and discussed at the precon meeting.

- 2. The following procedures shall be followed.
  - a. No Discoveries

In the event that no discoveries were encountered during night and/or weekend work, the PI shall record the information on the CSVR and submit to MMC via fax by 8:00 a.m. of the next business day.

b. Discoveries

All discoveries shall be processed and documented using the existing procedures detailed in Sections III - During Construction, and IV – Discovery of Human Remains. Discovery of human remains shall always be treated as a significant discovery.

c. Potentially Significant Discoveries

If the PI determines that a potentially significant discovery has been made, the procedures detailed under Section III - During Construction and IV – Discovery of Human Remains shall be followed.

- d. The PI shall immediately contact MMC, or by 8:00 a.m. of the next business day to report and discuss the findings as indicated in Section III-B, unless other specific arrangements have been made.
- B. If night and/or weekend work becomes necessary during the course of construction
  - 1. The CM shall notify the RE, or BI, as appropriate, a minimum of 24 hours before the work is to begin.
  - 2. The RE, or BI, as appropriate, shall notify MMC immediately.
- C. All other procedures described above shall apply, as appropriate.

#### VI. Post Construction

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

- a. For significant archaeological resources encountered during monitoring, the Archaeological Data Recovery Program shall be included in the Draft Monitoring Report.
- b. Recording Sites with State of California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR)

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

- 2. MMC shall return the Draft Monitoring Report to the PI for revision or, for preparation of the Final Report.
- 3. The PI shall submit revised Draft Monitoring Report to MMC for approval.
- 4. MMC shall provide written verification to the PI of the approved report.
- 5. MMC shall notify the RE or BI, as appropriate, of receipt of all Draft Monitoring Report submittals and approvals.
- B. Handling of Artifacts
  - 1. The PI shall be responsible for ensuring that all cultural remains collected are cleaned and cataloged.
  - 2. The PI shall be responsible for ensuring that all artifacts are analyzed to identify function and chronology as they relate to the history of the area; that faunal material is identified as to species; and that specialty studies are completed, as appropriate.
  - 3. The cost for curation is the responsibility of the property owner.
- C. Curation of artifacts: Accession Agreement and Acceptance Verification
  - The PI shall be responsible for ensuring that all artifacts associated with the survey, testing and/or data recovery for this project are permanently curated with an appropriate institution. This shall be completed in consultation with MMC and the Native American representative, as applicable.
  - 2. The PI shall include the Acceptance Verification from the curation institution in the Final Monitoring Report submitted to the RE or BI and MMC.
  - 3. When applicable to the situation, the PI shall include written verification from the Native American consultant/monitor indicating that Native American resources were treated in accordance with state law and/or applicable agreements. If the resources were reinterred, verification shall be provided to show what protective measures were taken

to ensure no further disturbance occurs in accordance with Section IV – Discovery of Human Remains, Subsection 5.

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

#### 4.4.3.4 Significance of Impacts after Mitigation

Implementation of the mitigation measure outlined above would reduce impacts to a level that is less than significant because the measure would facilitate the prompt discovery and safeguarding of potential subsurface cultural resources.

# 4.4.4 Issue 2: Religious/Sacred Uses

Would the project result in any impact to existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area?

#### 4.4.4.1 Impacts

Based on the results of the field survey and consultation of the California Historical Resources Information System, there are no known religious or sacred uses on-site or within the immediate vicinity of the project site. Therefore, implementation of the project would have no impact on religious or sacred uses.

#### 4.4.4.2 Significance of Impacts

Since no religious or sacred uses were identified within the project area, project development would result in less than significant impacts.

#### 4.4.4.3 Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting

Impacts would be less than significant; therefore, no mitigation is required.

# 4.4.5 Issue 3: Human Remains

Would the project result in the disturbance of any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

## 4.4.5.1 Impacts

Since there are no known burial sites or cemeteries within the vicinity of the project area, it is not expected that human remains would be disturbed as a result of the project. In the unlikely event of the discovery of human remains during project grading, work shall halt in that area and the procedures set forth in the California PRC (Section 5097.98) and State Health and Safety Code (Section 7050.5) shall be undertaken, as required in Section 4.4.3.3, Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting, above. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

## 4.4.5.2 Significance of Impacts

Since there are no known human remains on the project site and measures are in place in the unlikely event that remains are found, impacts would be less than significant.

## 4.4.5.3 Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting

Impacts would be less than significant; therefore, no mitigation is required.

#### 4.4.6 Changes in Results of the 1993 FEIR Impact Analysis

Implementation of the proposed project would not increase the severity of impacts associated with archaeological resources. The 1993 FEIR concluded that there would be no significant impacts associated with the project. The project would be required to comply with HIST-1, which would ensure that any potential impacts associated with the discovery of subsurface archaeological resources are reduced to below a level of significance. Thus, there would be no new significant or substantially increased adverse impacts beyond those previously identified in the 1993 FEIR.

# 4.5 Paleontological Resources

The 1993 FEIR did not directly assess paleontological resources; however, it did assess shallow, subsurface cultural deposits. Therefore, this section addresses the potential for ground-disturbing activities associated with the project to impact paleontological resources because project grading and ground disturbing activities may result in deeper excavations compared to past disturbances which may impact paleontological resources. The following analysis relies upon information about the subsoil conditions and underlying geologic formations obtained from the geotechnical report (Appendix F), as well as the paper "Paleontological Resources" prepared by Thomas A. Deméré and Stephen Walsh for the Department of Paleontology – San Diego Natural History Museum (November 2011).

# 4.5.1 Existing Conditions

Paleontological resources represent a limited, nonrenewable, and impact-sensitive scientific and educational resource. Paleontological resources are the remains and/or traces of prehistoric plant and animal life exclusive of man. Fossil remains such as bones, teeth, shells, and leaves are found in the geologic deposits where they were originally buried. Paleontological resources include not only the actual fossil remains, but also the collecting localities, and the geologic formations containing those localities.

Paleontological resource sensitivities are rated for individual formations and recognize the important relationship between fossils and the geologic formations within which they are entombed. Geologic formations are rated for paleontological resource potential according to the following scale (Deméré and Walsh 1994).

- High Sensitivity These formations contain a large number of known fossil localities. Generally, highly sensitive formations produce vertebrate fossil remains or are considered to have the potential to produce such remains.
- Moderate Sensitivity These formations have a moderate number of known fossil localities. Generally, moderately sensitive formations produce invertebrate fossil remains in high abundance or vertebrate fossil remains in low abundance.
- Low and/or Unknown Sensitivity These formations contain only a small number of known fossil localities and typically produce invertebrate fossil remains in low abundance. Unknown sensitivity is assigned to formations from which there are presently no known paleontological resources, but which have the potential for producing such remains based on their sedimentary origin.

• Very Low Sensitivity — Very low sensitivity is assigned to geologic formations that, based on their relative youthful age and/or high-energy depositional history, are judged to be unlikely to produce any fossil remains.

According to the geotechnical investigation (see Appendix F), the project site is underlain by previously placed fill, Scripps Formation, and Ardath Shale Formation. The makeup and paleontological resource potential of these underlying formations is as follows (City of San Diego 2011):

- Scripps Formation The Scripps Formation is composed of interbedded layers of sandstones, siltstones, and claystones, with some intermixed cobble conglomerate. This formation is of continental shelf marine origin and was deposited during the middle Eocene (47.8 million to 38 million years ago). Fossils from this formation are predominantly marine, and include bivalves, gastropods, crabs, sharks and rays, and bony fish. However, remains of fossil reptiles such as crocodiles and turtles, and land mammals have also been recovered from this formation. The Scripps Formation is considered a formation of High Sensitivity.
- Ardath Shale Formation The Ardath Shale is composed primarily of gray shale, siltstone, and interbedded sandstones. This marine formation was created by an ancient sea floor during the early middle Eocene, between 48 million and 47 million years ago. Fossils from this formation consist of marine invertebrates. The Ardath Shale is considered a formation of High Sensitivity.
- Previously Placed Fill Previously placed fill consists of materials either excavated on-site or imported onto the site and used to fill in below grade areas. It can also include material originating on-site that was excavated, mixed, and redeposited. Due to its highly disturbed condition, previously placed fill is considered to have Very Low Sensitivity.

# 4.5.2 Significance Determination Thresholds

Based on the City's 2011 Significance Determination Thresholds, paleontological resource impacts would be considered significant if the project would:

- 1. Require over 1,000 cubic yards of excavation in a high resource potential geologic deposit/formation/rock unit; or
- 2. Require over 2,000 cubic yards of excavation in a moderate resource potential geologic deposit/formation/rock unit.

The City has established the thresholds as shown below in Table 4.5-1 for identifying whether project grading would result in significant impacts according to sensitivity rating.

Table 4.5-1 Paleontological Grading Thresholds	
Sensitivity Rating	Excavation Volume and Depth Thresholds
High	>1,000 cubic yards and >10 feet deep
Moderate	>2,000 cubic yards and >10 feet deep
Low-Zero	Mitigation not required

# 4.5.3 Issues 1 and 2: High and Moderate Resource Potential

Would the project require over 1,000 cubic yards of excavation in a high resource potential formation or over 2,000 cubic yards of excavation in a moderate resource potential formation that would result in the loss of significant paleontological resources?

# 4.5.3.1 Impacts

The project site contains geologic formations considered to be of high sensitivity for fossils. Based on the City's thresholds, a significant impact would occur if grading exceeds 1,000 cubic yards and is 10 or more feet deep in the Scripps and Ardath formations. In order to implement the proposed project, 12.88 acres of the 58.19-acre site would be graded. Approximately 60,200 cubic yards of cut would be required within areas underlain by the Scripps and Ardath formations which could cause physical destruction of fossil remains. In particular, excavation for the parking structure would extend to depths of 27 to 35 feet. In this area, artificial fill overlays the Scripps and Ardath formations by less that 2 to about 5 feet so it is evident that excavation would extend into fossilbearing formations. Therefore the project has the potential to create significant impacts to paleontological resources. Due to the very low paleontological resource potential of fill, grading within areas of "previously placed fill," as shown in the geotechnical report (see Appendix F), would be less than significant.

#### 4.5.3.2 Significance of Impacts

Implementation of the project has the potential to result in significant impacts to paleontological resources due to grading within the Scripps and Ardath formations to the extent listed in Table 4.5-1.

## 4.5.3.3 Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting

**PALEO-1:** To reduce or avoid potential direct impacts to paleontological resources, the project shall be conditioned to implement the following:

#### I. Prior to Permit Issuance

- A. Entitlements Plan Check
  - Prior to issuance of any construction permits, including, but not limited to, the first Grading Permit, Demolition Plans/Permits and Building Plans/Permits or a Notice to Proceed for Subdivisions, but prior to the first preconstruction meeting, whichever is applicable, the Assistant Deputy Director (ADD) Environmental Designee shall verify that the requirements for Paleontological Monitoring have been noted on the appropriate construction documents.
- B. Letters of Qualification have been submitted to ADD
  - The applicant shall submit a letter of verification to the City Mitigation Monitoring Coordination (MMC) identifying the Principal Investigator (PI) for the project and the names of all persons involved in the paleontological monitoring program, as defined in the City Paleontology Guidelines.
  - 2. MMC will provide a letter to the applicant confirming the qualifications of the PI and all persons involved in the paleontological monitoring of the project.
  - 3. Prior to the start of work, the applicant shall obtain approval from MMC for any personnel changes associated with the monitoring program.

#### II. Prior to Start of Construction

- A. Verification of Records Search
  - The PI shall provide verification to MMC that a site specific records search has been completed. Verification includes, but is not limited to, a copy of a confirmation letter from San Diego Natural History Museum, other institution or, if the search was in-house, a letter of verification from the PI stating that the search was completed.
  - 2. The letter shall introduce any pertinent information concerning expectations and probabilities of discovery during trenching and/or grading activities.
- B. PI Shall Attend Precon Meetings
  - Prior to beginning any work that requires monitoring; the Applicant shall arrange a
    precon meeting that shall include the PI, Construction Manager (CM) and/or Grading
    Contractor (GC), Resident Engineer (RE), Building Inspector (BI), if appropriate, and MMC.
    The qualified paleontologist shall attend any grading/excavation related precon
    meetings to make comments and/or suggestions concerning the paleontological
    monitoring program with the CM and/or GC.
    - a. If the PI is unable to attend the precon meeting, the Applicant shall schedule a focused precon meeting with MMC, the PI, RE, CM, or BI, if appropriate, prior to the start of any work that requires monitoring.

- 2. Identify Areas to be Monitored
  - a. Prior to the start of any work that requires monitoring, the PI shall submit a Paleontological Monitoring Exhibit (PME) based on the appropriate construction documents (reduced to 11x17) to MMC identifying the areas to be monitored, including the delineation of grading/excavation limits. The PME shall be based on the results of a site-specific records search as well as information regarding existing known soil conditions (native or formation).
- 3. When Monitoring Will Occur
  - a. Prior to the start of any work, the PI shall also submit a construction schedule to MMC through the RE indicating when and where monitoring will occur.
  - b. The PI may submit a detailed letter to MMC prior to the start of work or during construction requesting a modification to the monitoring program. This request shall be based on relevant information such as review of final construction documents which indicate conditions such as depth of excavation and/or site graded to bedrock, presence or absence of fossil resources, etc., which may reduce or increase the potential for resources to be present.

#### III. During Construction

- A. Monitor Shall be Present During Grading/Excavation/Trenching
  - The monitor shall be present full-time during grading/excavation/trenching activities as identified on the PME that could result in impacts to formations with high and moderate resource sensitivity. The CM is responsible for notifying the RE, PI, and MMC of changes to any construction activities such as in the case of a potential safety concern within the area being monitored. In certain circumstances Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) safety requirements may necessitate modification of the PME.
  - 2. The PI may submit a detailed letter to MMC during construction requesting a modification to the monitoring program when a field condition, such as trenching activities, do not encounter formational soils as previously assumed, and/or when unique/unusual fossils are encountered which may reduce or increase the potential for resources to be present.
  - 3. The monitor shall document field activity via the Consultant Site Visit Record (CSVR). The CSVRs shall be faxed by the CM to the RE the first day of monitoring, the last day of monitoring, monthly (**Notification of Monitoring Completion**), and in the case of ANY discoveries. The RE shall forward copies to MMC.

- B. Discovery Notification Process
  - 1. In the event of a discovery, the paleontological monitor shall direct the contractor to temporarily divert trenching activities in the area of discovery and immediately notify the RE or BI, as appropriate.
  - 2. The monitor shall immediately notify the PI (unless monitor is the PI) of the discovery.
  - 3. The PI shall immediately notify MMC by phone of the discovery, and shall also submit written documentation to MMC within 24 hours by fax or e-mail with photos of the resource in context, if possible.
- C. Determination of Significance
  - 1. The PI shall evaluate the significance of the resource.
    - a. The PI shall immediately notify MMC by phone to discuss significance determination and shall also submit a letter to MMC indicating whether additional mitigation is required. The determination of significance for fossil discoveries shall be at the discretion of the PI.
    - b. If the resource is significant, the PI shall submit a Paleontological Recovery Program (PRP) and obtain written approval from MMC. Impacts to significant resources must be mitigated before ground disturbing activities in the area of discovery will be allowed to resume.
    - c. If a resource is not significant (e.g., small pieces of broken common shell fragments or other scattered common fossils), the PI shall notify the RE, or BI as appropriate, that a non-significant discovery has been made. The Paleontologist shall continue to monitor the area without notification to MMC unless a significant resource is encountered.
    - d. The PI shall submit a letter to MMC indicating that fossil resources will be collected, curated, and documented in the final monitoring report. The letter shall also indicate that no further work is required.

#### IV. Night and/or Weekend Work

- A. If night and/or weekend work is included in the contract.
  - 1. When night and/or weekend work is included in the contract package, the extent and timing shall be presented and discussed at the precon meeting.

- 2. The following procedures shall be followed.
  - a. No Discoveries

In the event that no discoveries were encountered during night and/or weekend work, the PI shall record the information on the CSVR and submit to MMC via fax by 8:00 a.m. on the next business day.

b. Discoveries

All discoveries shall be processed and documented using the existing procedures detailed in Section III — During Construction.

c. Potentially Significant Discoveries

If the PI determines that a potentially significant discovery has been made, the procedures detailed under Section III — During Construction shall be followed.

- d. The PI shall immediately contact MMC, or by 8:00 a.m. on the next business day, to report and discuss the findings as indicated in Section III-B, unless other specific arrangements have been made.
- B. If night work becomes necessary during the course of construction.
  - 1. The CM shall notify the RE or BI, as appropriate, a minimum of 24 hours before the work is to begin.
  - 2. The RE or BI, as appropriate, shall notify MMC immediately.
- C. All other procedures described above shall apply, as appropriate.

#### V. Post Construction

- A. Preparation and Submittal of Draft Monitoring Report
  - 1. The PI shall submit two copies of the draft monitoring report (even if negative), prepared in accordance with the Paleontological Guidelines, which describes the results, analysis, and conclusions of all phases of the Paleontological Monitoring Program (with appropriate graphics) to MMC for review and approval within 90 days following the completion of monitoring,
    - a. For significant paleontological resources encountered during monitoring, the PRP shall be included in the draft monitoring report.
    - b. Recording Sites with the San Diego Natural History Museum

The PI shall be responsible for recording (on the appropriate forms) any significant or potentially significant fossil resources encountered during the Paleontological

Monitoring Program in accordance with the City's Paleontological Guidelines, and submittal of such forms to the San Diego Natural History Museum with the final monitoring report.

- 2. MMC shall return the draft monitoring report to the PI for revision or, for preparation of the final report.
- 3. The PI shall submit revised draft monitoring report to MMC for approval.
- 4. MMC shall provide written verification to the PI of the approved report.
- 5. MMC shall notify the RE or BI, as appropriate, of receipt of all draft monitoring report submittals and approvals.
- B. Handling of Fossil Remains
  - 1. The PI shall be responsible for ensuring that all fossil remains collected are cleaned and catalogued.
  - 2. The PI shall be responsible for ensuring that all fossil remains are analyzed to identify function and chronology as they relate to the geologic history of the area, that faunal material is identified as to species, and that specialty studies are completed, as appropriate.
- C. Curation of Fossil Remains: Deed of Gift and Acceptance Verification
  - 1. The PI shall be responsible for ensuring that all fossil remains associated with the monitoring for this project are permanently curated with an appropriate institution.
  - 2. The PI shall include the acceptance verification from the curation institution in the final monitoring report submitted to the RE or BI and MMC.
- D. Final Monitoring Report(s)
  - 1. The PI shall submit two copies of the final monitoring report to MMC (even if negative) within 90 days after notification from MMC that the draft report has been approved.
  - 2. The RE shall, in no case, issue the Notice of Completion until receiving a copy of the approved final monitoring report from MMC which includes the Acceptance Verification from the curation institution.

# 4.5.3.4 Significance of Impacts After Mitigation

Implementation of the mitigation measure outlined above would reduce impacts to a level that is less than significant because it would provide for the recovery of fossil material that otherwise could be lost during grading.

# 4.5.4 Changes in Results of the 1993 FEIR Impact Analysis

The 1993 FEIR did not analyze paleontological resources; however, the project would be required to implement the PALEO-1 mitigation measure which would ensure that impacts associated with the project grading would be reduced to a level that is less than significant. Therefore, no new significant or substantially increased adverse impacts beyond those previously identified in the 1993 FEIR would result.

# 4.6 Visual Quality/Neighborhood Character

This section addresses the visual aspects of the project as related to views and compatibility with existing neighborhood character, through project design including the height, bulk, scale, and architectural design. The 1993 FEIR addressed Visual Quality in Chapter 5, Effects Not Found to be Significant. The discussion concluded that the proposed use of the site is consistent with the land uses that already exist on Campus Point. In addition, since the site had already been mass graded and no further grading of natural slopes would occur, the project would not significantly affect the character of the area.

With respect to visual quality, the 1993 FEIR acknowledges that the on-site development would be visible from distant mesas to the west and east as well as from segments of Interstate 5 (I-5) and Genesee Avenue to the west, but that the line-of-sight views would not be significantly affected because of the grade of the freeway being approximately 125 feet below the project. The approved Planned Industrial Development (PID) envisioned multi-story buildings on the site, and the 1993 FEIR concluded that the project would not have an adverse visual impact on the Campus Point area. The site had already been developed and graded at that time and the EIR indicated that the remaining vacant portion of the site is the only major land area in the Campus Point area which has not yet been developed. From I-5 and developed mesas to the west and east, the development would be perceived as completion of the Campus Point development and no significant impacts would occur.

Since the preparation of the 1993 FEIR, the vision for the development of the Campus Pointe site has changed from constructing up to seven (including the existing CP2) smaller buildings (up to 6 stories) within the southern and central portions of the site, to constructing one taller building (tiered 6 and 12 stories aboveground) and one 2-story amenity structure. Therefore, this SEIR assesses visual quality and neighborhood character for consistency with surrounding development and relevant design regulations of the General Plan, University Community Plan (UCP), and the Land Development Code (LDC).

# 4.6.1 Existing Conditions

#### 4.6.1.1 Site Topography and Setting

The project site is located on a mesa in a topographically diverse area, ranging from rolling ridges and side canyons through mesa areas to the precipitous canyon edges overlooking Sorrento Valley. Although the perimeter of the project site has slopes up to 130 feet in height, the developed area of the site is relatively flat with slopes of 0 to 15 percent grade. The mesa falls off steeply on the northwest, northeast, east, and south. The project site is bounded on the north by undeveloped land, on the west by a steep hillside (a portion of which is a manufactured slope) adjacent to I-5, on the southeast by Campus Point Drive, on the south by an industrial development, and on the east by steep slopes and open space (see Figure 2-3). The developed area of the site includes an existing scientific research and development building, accessory structures, surface parking, and ornamental landscaping. The open space area contains naturalized vegetation communities and slopes.

## 4.6.1.2 Applicable General Plan Plans, Policies, and Regulations

In its Urban Design Element, the General Plan includes goals and policies that emphasize the integration of compatible land uses, the provision of high-quality public spaces and civic architecture, as well as the enhancement of the visual quality of all types of development. The Urban Design Element policies that are relevant to the design of the project and the project's consistency with these policies are summarized in Section 4.1.3.1.

#### 4.6.1.3 Existing Visual Character

Visual sensitivity can be described as viewer awareness of visible changes in the environment and is based on a viewer's presence in public areas near a particular site. Sensitivity relates to the overall visual character of the area and visibility of the project site. To define the existing visual quality of the project area, public viewing areas can include road view sheds, public viewpoints, and other key views, as defined within adopted plans.

The project site is visible from surrounding area roadways. These include northbound and southbound I-5 between Genesee Avenue and Sorrento Valley Road and westbound on Genesee Avenue approaching I-5. The views from I-5 and Genesee Avenue are within the context of the developed mesas and are comprised primarily the freeway corridor steep slopes and the medical complexes and office buildings. There are also views of the site from I-805. There are no public viewpoints of the project site in the immediate vicinity and the UCP does not identify any key views in the area.

# 4.6.2 Significance Determination Thresholds

Based on the City's 2011 Significance Determination Thresholds, a project would have a significant impact on visual quality and neighborhood character if the project would:

- 1. Result in a substantial obstruction of any vista or scenic view from a public viewing area as identified in the community plan;
- 2. Result in bulk, scale, materials, or style which would be incompatible with surrounding development, result in a substantial alteration to the existing or planned character of the area, or result in a substantial change in the existing landform; or
- 3. Result in substantial light or glare which would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area.

# 4.6.3 Issue 1: Public Views

Would the project result in a substantial obstruction of any vista or scenic view from a public viewing area as identified in the community plan?

# 4.6.3.1 Impacts

The UCP does not identify any specific public view corridors or public vantage points. Instead, policies provide guidance on design considerations intended to maintain open views and visual access from public roadways to open space areas. Portions of the project would be visible from I-5 and I-805, from adjacent properties to the south and from properties at higher elevations to the west. Views from private property are not considered by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) or protected by the City.

As proposed, development on the project site would be expanded by adding two new buildings and a parking structure. These new features would include a tiered 6- to 12-story building (CP3) along the western boundary, a 6-story parking structure along the southern boundary, and a 2-story building (CP4) internal to the site. Building CP3 would be visible from along the I-5 corridor (both north- and southbound) and from I-805 (northbound). The parking structure would be visible from the I-5 (northbound only), and CP4 would not be visible from any public location. The project site slopes upward from I-5 with a substantial grade differential between the freeway and the project site (approximately 125 feet). The tiered 6- and 12-story Building CP3 would have a maximum height of 195 feet, and the parking structure would be 51 feet 11 inches in height. The existing mature trees at the top of the slope would remain, and additional ornamental trees would be planted. The visual alteration would be similar to that of the buildings south of the project, which are visible along the I-5 corridor. Thus, while the project would minimally alter views of the site from I-5, it would not block any public view corridors or result in a blockage of a public resource from a public viewing area. Impacts would be less than significant.

## 4.6.3.2 Significance of Impacts

The project would not substantially alter public views given the existing visual context along the I-5 corridor in the project vicinity and impacts would be less than significant.

## 4.6.3.3 Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting

Impacts are less than significant. No mitigation is required.

# 4.6.4 Issue 2: Neighborhood Character/ Architecture/ Development Features/ Bulk and Scale

Would the project result in bulk, scale, materials, or style which would be incompatible with surrounding development, result in a substantial alteration to the existing or planned character of the area, or result in a substantial change in the existing landform?

# 4.6.4.1 Impacts

Design guidelines have been included in the Campus Point Master Plan which would ensure that the development of the site would be in conformance with applicable policies and regulations. The buildings and structures would comply with the development standards of the IP-1-1 zone and the approved PID. The project does not propose deviations for height, bulk, or coverage regulations. The design guidelines for the project specify that site design, building massing, and architectural design shall be complementary to the existing research and development building on-site. In conformance with policies regarding development near open space, the proposed comprehensive site design has clustered new development on previously disturbed areas and utilized parking garages to minimize the development footprint, thereby preserving the open space area. Minimal landform alteration is proposed. Visual connectivity to the open space would be maintained by breaking up the new development into multiple buildings and parking structures, thereby allowing for views into the open space area. For these reasons, the project would not create a disorganized appearance.

The proposed CP3 building would be articulated with offsets, varying parapet heights, and other architectural details to provide variety and interest. Materials and finishes selected would be complementary to the existing buildings. The parking structure would have architectural screening and trees planted along the perimeter. Entryways to buildings would be demarcated by pedestrian entrances connecting to pedestrian paths that provide site circulation. Amenities would include outdoor gathering areas shaded by trees near each building. Mature trees would be retained and additional ornamental landscaping would consist of drought-resistant trees and shrubs that would blend with more naturalized planting areas which would provide a landscape transition to the vegetation communities in the open space area. Because of the architectural variation and the site design, the project would not create a monotonous building façade.

The project site is located on the mesa edge adjacent to I-5, and the proposed buildings at the western perimeter of the site would be visible from the I-5 corridor. However, the 6- and-12-story project is consistent with the existing structural height and character of other non-residential buildings located along the I-5 corridor. These include the Scripps parking structure (7 stories); the Prebys Institute (9 stories); the Jacobs Medical Institute (10 stories); the Hyatt Regency (11 stories); and the San Diego California Latter Day Saints (Mormon) Temple (165 feet). In addition, the project would be consistent with City policies and regulations and would be complementary to the existing buildings on the site and surrounding campus development. As discussed above, the project would be visible from I-5, but the impacts due to the bulk and scale of the project would be less than significant.

## 4.6.4.2 Significance of Impacts

The proposed project would be compatible with the surrounding development on the mesas adjacent to the I-5 corridor and would not represent a substantial alteration to the character of the area. As such, significant impacts would not occur.

#### 4.6.4.3 Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting

No mitigation would be required.

# 4.6.5 Issue 3: Light/Glare

Would the project result in substantial light or glare which would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area?

# 4.6.5.1 Impacts

According to the design guidelines, building materials would be composed of metal, concrete, and glass complementary to the existing buildings on-site. The project would comply with LDC Glare Regulations (LDC section 142.0730), which limit reflective exterior building material to 30 percent reflectivity composing no more than 50 percent of each exterior façade. Conformance with General Plan and UCP policies on lighting would require the lighting to be of pedestrian-scale, limited, and directed to the site to avoid lighting spill over onto adjacent properties. Impacts would be less than significant.

## 4.6.5.2 Significance of Impacts

The proposed project would comply with the Design Guidelines for the Campus Point Master Plan and LDC for lighting and impacts would be less than significant.

#### 4.6.5.3 Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting

Impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

# 4.6.6 Comparison to the 1993 FEIR

The 1993 FEIR concluded that while the development would be visible from distant mesas to the west and east and from certain segments of I-5 and Genesee Avenue, line-of-sight views would not be significantly affected because the grade of the freeway is 125 feet lower than the project. The analysis goes on to state that because the project would simply be utilizing the remainder of the undeveloped land in Campus Point, the development would be perceived by viewers as completion of the Campus Point development and no significant impacts were anticipated.

As analyzed above, the proposed project, by comparison, would somewhat alter views of the site from I-5, but would not block any public view corridors or result in blockage of a public resource from a CEQA-protected public viewing area. The project would also include design guidelines to protect the neighborhood character and to ensure that the project would be constructed in conformance with applicable policies and regulations. In addition, as discussed in Section 4.6.4 above, the project's height and character is consistent with other non-residential buildings along the mesa rims adjacent to the I-5 corridor. Minimal grading and landform alteration is proposed. The project would not disturb any of the site's existing open space or steep slopes, and proposes additional landscaping to ensure that impacts would be less than significant. Lastly, the project's design guidelines with respect to building windows and finishes are complementary to the existing buildings and are in conformance with the LDC Glare Regulations in order to ensure that light and glare impacts would be less than significant.

# 5

# Chapter 5 Significant Unavoidable Environmental Effects/Irreversible Changes

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15126.2(b) and (c) require that the significant unavoidable impacts of the project, as well as any significant irreversible environmental changes that would result from project implementation, be addressed in the SEIR.

# 5.1 Significant Environmental Effects Which Cannot Be Avoided if the Project is Implemented

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(b), significant unavoidable impacts of a project include those impacts that can be mitigated but not reduced to below a level of significance despite implementation of all feasible mitigation measures, must be identified in the EIR.

Previously identified significant unmitigated impacts associated with the 1993 FEIR included:

- Traffic (direct) impacts at:
  - o Regents Road, South of Genesee
  - o Genesee/Campus Point Drive
  - o Genesee/Regents Road
- Traffic (cumulative) impacts at the following segments and intersections:
  - o Genesee Avenue, west of Interstate 5 (I-5)
  - o Genesee Avenue, I-5 to Campus Point Drive
  - o Genesee Avenue, Campus Point Drive to Regents Road
  - o La Jolla Village Drive, West of Genesee Avenue
- o Genesee Avenue/I-5 NB and SB Ramps
- o Genesee Avenue/Campus Point Drive
- o Genesee Avenue/Regents Road
- o Genesee Avenue/Eastgate Mall
- Land Use Cumulative impacts relative to traffic, air quality, and Noise impacts, making it impossible to achieve the environmental goals of the Community Plan.
- Noise Cumulative impacts on existing residential development in the University community.
- Air Quality Direct impacts relative to localized traffic impacts in addition to cumulative impacts.

The project would result in one new significant impact which is associated with an issue not previously identified in the 1993 FEIR – Paleontological Resources. This impact would be mitigated through requirements for monitoring during grading (see Section 4.5).

Relative to the traffic impacts, the project-specific Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) concluded that all of the segments and intersections that were previously found to be significant and not mitigated would be less than significant or mitigable at this time with the proposed project. However, the proposed project would have three new impacts that were not previously identified. These include the two impacts at Genesee Avenue (TR-1) and the Genesee Avenue/I-5 southbound ramps intersection (TR-3) (refer to Section 4.2). Both of these impacts would be temporarily significant and unmitigated because the mitigation measure (widening of the Genesee Avenue bridge) is out of the control of the applicant. The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) has planned and fully funded I-5/Genesee Avenue interchange improvements that would mitigate these impacts and the improvements are under construction and anticipated to be completed in fall 2017. The third impact would be Impact TR-4 which consists of both the direct and cumulative impacts occurring at the Genesee Avenue/La Jolla Village Drive intersection. The proposed mitigation at this intersection would be to widen the northbound approach to provide a dedicated right-turn lane. This dedicated right-turn lane is already scheduled to be constructed along with other improvements on Genesee Avenue; the project is fully funded and construction is anticipated to start in February 2017. However, the project's impact to the Genesee Avenue/La Jolla Village Drive intersection will remain significant and unmitigated in the short term until construction of the Genesee Avenue project is completed.

All other significant impacts (i.e., land use, other transportation/circulation, biological resources, historical resources, and paleontological resources) identified in this SEIR resulting from project implementation would be reduced to below a level of significance with the implementation of mitigation measures identified in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (Chapter 10).

## 5.2 Irreversible Environmental Changes Which Would Result if the Project is Implemented

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(c):

Uses of nonrenewable resources during the initial and continued phases of the project may be irreversible since a large commitment of such resources makes removal or nonuse thereafter unlikely. Primary impacts and, particularly, secondary impacts (such as highway improvements which provide access to a previously inaccessible area) generally commit future generations to similar uses. Also irreversible damage can result from environmental accidents associated with the project. Irretrievable commitments of resources should be evaluated to assure that such current consumption is justified.

Non-renewable resources generally include agricultural land, biological, archaeological and paleontological resources, mineral deposits, water bodies, and some energy sources. As evaluated in Chapter 8 of this SEIR, implementation of the project would not result in significant, irreversible impacts to agricultural or mineral resources.

While there would be no direct impacts within the Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA), indirect impacts to coastal California gnatcatcher could result from excessive noise and lighting generated from project construction adjacent to occupied habitat in the MHPA during the breeding season (March 1–August 15). Both direct and indirect impacts could also potentially occur to nesting or migratory birds, including the Cooper's hawk and other raptors, as a result of the removal of Diegan coastal sage scrub, non-native grassland, and eucalyptus woodland habitats on-site. Also, indirect impacts could result from excessive noise and lighting generated from project construction should grading occur within or adjacent to occupied habitat in the MHPA during the typical bird breeding season (February 1–September 15). The project would be required to implement the Land Use Adjacency Guidelines (mitigation measure LU-1) which would avoid significant MHPA adjacency impacts, as well as the potential noise impacts to coastal California gnatcatcher occupied habitat. With respect to migratory and nesting birds, including Cooper's hawk, project impacts would be significant and would require implementation of BIO-1.

Additionally, there is a potential for significant subsurface cultural or paleontological deposits to be uncovered and destroyed during grading, thereby resulting in a significant impact. These impacts would be mitigated via requirements for archaeological and paleontological monitoring during grading activities (HIST-1 and PALEO-1).

Implementation of the project would require the irreversible consumption of natural resources and energy. Natural resource consumption would include lumber and other forest products, sand and gravel, asphalt, steel, copper, other metals, and water. Building materials, while perhaps recyclable in part at some long-term future date, would for practical purposes be considered permanently consumed. Energy derived from non-renewable sources, such as fossil and nuclear fuels, would be consumed during construction and operational lighting, heating, cooling, and transportation uses. To reduce the use of energy, water, and other natural resources, the project would incorporate sustainable building practices into the site, architectural, and landscape designs. As described in Section 3.3 of this EIR, design considerations aimed at improving energy efficiency and reducing water use would be incorporated into the project design and would serve to reduce irreversible water, energy, and building materials consumption associated with construction and occupation of the project.

# 6

# Chapter 6 Growth Inducement

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15126.2(d) requires that an EIR:

Discuss ways in which the proposed project could foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment. Included are projects which would remove obstacles to population growth (for example, a major expansion of a waste water treatment plant might allow for more construction in service areas). Increases in the population might tax existing community services facilities, requiring construction of new facilities that could cause significant environmental effects. . . It must not be assumed that growth in any area is necessarily beneficial, detrimental, or of little significance to the environment.

The City's 2011 Significance Determination Thresholds provide further guidance to determine potential significance for growth inducement. Based on the thresholds, a significant impact could occur if a project would:

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). Accelerated growth may further strain existing community facilities or encourage activities that could significantly affect the surrounding environment.

The 1993 FEIR concluded that the development was an "infill" project with existing utilities and access (Genesee Avenue). At the time the northern portion of the site was already developed as well as land immediately adjacent to the south. Therefore, the 1993 FEIR determined that the project did not have a significant growth inducement effect on the area. The project, by comparison, would intensify the site in a manner similar to what was analyzed in the 1993 FEIR site, but proposes 148,892 fewer square feet compared to the previous project. Thus, consistent with the conclusions

of the 1993 FEIR, the project would not induce growth directly or indirectly by providing improvements to the area because it will not remove any obstacles or create any new infrastructure.

## 6.1 **Population and Growth Projections**

Implementation of the project would not significantly alter the planned location, distribution, or growth of the human population in the area. The project would add two new buildings and a new parking structure on a developed site that contains a two-story, 463,791-square-foot, multi-tenant building and a 267,934-square-foot building, both of which are used for scientific research and development. The project would add an additional 315,000 square feet of scientific research space and an amenity/retail structure ("Alexhaus") within previously disturbed land occupied by surface parking. The project could attract residents to the area due to a demand for employment; but the growth would not result in a substantial increase in population or demand for housing. Some portion of future employees would likely reside locally, while some percentage would likely relocate to the area for employment. Existing population projections for the region account for population increases associated with economic growth and employment opportunities. Thus, the growth associated with the provision of new employment opportunities would not be considered substantial or beyond existing growth projections for the region.

# 6.2 Public Infrastructure

The project site would accommodate development in a location already served by public infrastructure. Because the project is located in an already urbanized area, project implementation would not remove obstacles to population growth. Access to the site would be obtained on existing roads, and the larger public infrastructure (e.g., trunk sewers, water mains) have sufficient capacity to support build-out of the project.

Although the project could produce increased demand for fire protection and emergency medical services, police protection, and water, wastewater, and solid waste facilities, these anticipated increases would not significantly tax existing community services facilities or require construction of new facilities that would cause significant environmental effects, as evaluated in Chapter 8 of this EIR.



# Chapter 7 Cumulative Impacts

Section 15130(a) of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines requires a discussion of cumulative impacts of a project "when the project's incremental effect is cumulatively considerable." Cumulatively considerable, as defined in Section 15065(c), "means that the incremental effects of an individual project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects." According to Section 15130 of the CEQA Guidelines, the discussion of cumulative effects "need not be provided in as great detail as is provided the effects attributable to the project alone. The discussion should be guided by the standards of practicality and reasonableness."

The 1993 FEIR analyzed the previous project in conjunction with other surrounding projects in the University Community Plan (UCP). At that time, this included the Sheraton Hotel, La Jolla Spectrum, La Jolla Cancer Research Expansion, La Jolla Pines Technology Centre, Torrey Pines Science & Business Centers, University of California, San Diego (UCSD) East Campus, Scripps Memorial Hospital, SAIC, Scripps Clinic Aerobics/Sports Medicine Center, and the Calbiochem-Balit U.S. Holding Expansion. The analysis concluded that the previous project, along with the 12 cumulative projects, would significantly impact the intersections of Genesee Avenue at Campus Point Drive, Regents Road, and Eastgate Mall. The automobile trips associated with the project, in conjunction with the 12 cumulative projects, were also concluded to cause significant cumulative noise and air quality impacts that would not be mitigable. Lastly, the 1993 FEIR concluded that the cumulative effects on the water quality of the Los Peñasquitos Lagoon could be significantly impacted due to increased surface runoff and the associated pollutants; however, the implementation of the city-wide Urban Stormwater Best Management Plan would mitigate the contribution to hydrology/water quality impacts to below a level of significance.

The following evaluation of cumulative impacts updates the 1993 FEIR and considers currently relevant reasonably foreseeable projects (see Table 7-1) in the vicinity of the project site. According to Section 15130(b)(1) of the CEQA Guidelines, the discussion of cumulative effects is to be on either (a) "a list of past, present, and probable future projects producing related or cumulative impacts,

including, if necessary, those impacts outside the control of the agency," or (b) "a summary of projections contained in an adopted plan or related planning document, or in a prior environmental document which has been adopted or certified, which described or evaluated regional or area wide conditions contributing to the cumulative impact. Any such planning document shall be referenced and made available to the public at a location specified by the Lead Agency."

The basis of and geographic area for the analysis of cumulative impacts is dependent on the nature of the issue. For this analysis, where evaluation of potential cumulative impacts are localized (e.g., noise, traffic, public utilities), a list of projects method was employed. For potential cumulative impacts that are more regional in scope (e.g., air quality, global warming, biological, and cultural resources), planning documents were additionally used in the analysis.

#### List of Projects Considered for Cumulative Analysis

Table 7-1 shows the past, present, and probable future projects considered in this cumulative effects evaluation.

	List of Projects in Vicinity	Table 7-1 / Used to Evaluate Cumulative Effec	ts
	Project Name/Location	Type/Description	Status/Environmental Review
1)	Scripps Memorial Hospital – La Jolla Master Plan Located at the southeast corner of the I-5/Genesee Avenue Interchange	Increase of 411,729 sf Medical Office and Increase of 142 beds	Approved
2)	La Jolla Commons Located on the east side of Judicial Drive just North of La Jolla Village Drive.	1,000,000 sf Office and 30,000 sf R&D/Office	Approved
3)	Biomed Innovation Center Located north of Miramar Road on the west side of the I-805.	250,000 sf R&D/Office	Approved
4)	Scripps Green Hospital Located east of North Torrey Pines Road near John Jay Hopkins Drive.	39,024 sf Hospital and 125,000 sf Cancer Treatment Facility	Approved
5)	Salk Institute Located on the southwest corner of North Torrey Pines Road and Torrey Pines Scenic Drive.	239,182 sf Science Research	Approved
6)	Genesee Executive Plaza Located on the northeast corner of Genesee Avenue and Executive Drive.	22,500 sf Medical Office Conversion	Approved
7)	University City Village	1,109DU Senior Housing; 80-bed Assisted Living	Under construction
8)	UCSD East Campus Bed Tower Located within east campus Medical Center area of the UCSD campus.	245 beds Hospital	Approved

Table 7-1 List of Projects in Vicinity Used to Evaluate Cumulative Effects					
Project Name/Location	Type/Description	Status/Environmental Review			
<ol> <li>Coast Income Properties</li> <li>Located on the northwest corner of</li> <li>Eastgate Mall and Town Centre Drives.</li> </ol>	51,086 sf R&D/Office	Approved			
<ol> <li>UTC Revitalization Project</li> <li>The site is bounded on the north by La Jolla</li> <li>Village Drive, on the east by Town Centre</li> <li>Drive, on the south by Nobel Drive, and on</li> <li>the west by Genesee Avenue.</li> </ol>	750,000 sf Regional Retail and 300 Multi-Family DU	Under construction			
<ol> <li>La Jolla Centre III Located at southwest corner of Judicial Drive and Executive Drive.</li> </ol>	340,000 sf Commercial Office	Approved			
12) Monte Verde Located at the southwest corner of Genesee Avenue and La Jolla Village Drive.	560 DU (high density)	Approved			
<ul> <li>13) Torrey Pines City Park Expansion (Glider Port) Located at North Torrey Pines Road and Torrey Pines Scenic Drive.</li> </ul>	5-acre City Park	Approved			
14) 9455 Towne Center Drive	150,000 sf R&D/Office	Under Review			
sf = square feet; DU = dwelling unit; R&D = Resea	arch and Development				

#### **Plans Considered for Cumulative Effects Analysis**

This cumulative analysis relies on regional planning documents and associated CEQA documents to serve as an additional basis for the analysis of the broader, regional cumulative effects of the project, such as air quality, and biological resources. The regional planning documents used in this analysis include: the San Diego Air Pollution Control District (SDAPCD) Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS), and the City's General Plan and EIR, the UCP, and the Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP). These plans are discussed in Chapter 4, Environmental Analysis, of this EIR, and are incorporated by reference in the appropriate sections of the cumulative analysis below.

## 7.1 Land Use

As a general rule, and as stated in the City's Significance Determination Thresholds for land use, projects that are consistent and compatible with surrounding land uses and the applicable community plan should not result in land use impacts. The project site is designated as Scientific Research and Open Space by the UCP. The UCP also identifies that the traffic generated at the site must be mitigated to 18,000 square feet per acre (sf/ac) through a Transportation System Management (TSM). The project includes a UCP amendment to remove the existing requirement that the project mitigate traffic through a TSM.

As described in Section 4.1, Land Use, overall, the project would be consistent with most of the City General Plan and UCP goals, objectives, and policies regarding the provision and protection of prime industrial lands and job promotion, preservation of open space, and implementation of green building design that includes improved energy efficiency and water conservation. As the project includes a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) to reduce project trips, the reduction in trips to the equivalent of an 18,000 sf/ac development cannot be guaranteed and therefore compliance with this UCP requirement would not be ensured. As described under Section 4.2, Transportation/Circulation, the project's contribution to the temporarily significant direct impact at Genesee and Interstate 5 would be fully mitigated upon completion of the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) improvement project which is due to be completed by fall of 2017. By extension, as no direct impact would occur because the project would become consistent with the UCP, no cumulative impact would occur

With respect to the potential for the project to expose people to noise levels which are incompatible with the Noise Compatibility Guidelines (Table NE-3) in the City's General Plan Noise Element, cumulative noise impacts would generally be attributed to increases in traffic volumes. Because the noise analysis conducted for this EIR used cumulative traffic volumes identified for area roads in the traffic impact assessment (TIA), the project noise analysis provides a cumulative analysis as well. An increase of 3 decibels (dB) is considered a perceptible increase in noise and a significant impact would occur if project implementation would expose on- or off-site, existing, and planned sensitive uses to road noise 3 dB over existing noise levels. The noise analysis shows that on a cumulative basis, the project would result in future cumulative noise increases that are less than 3 dB at all roadway segments. Thus, existing uses in the project vicinity would not be exposed to a significant cumulative increase in noise and the project would be consistent with the General Plan Noise Element.

The project's development footprint is adjacent to on-site MHPA and the project site is also adjacent to off-site MHPA lands along the northern and eastern boundaries. As discussed in Section 4.1.6, the MSCP establishes land use adjacency guidelines to be addressed on a project-by-project basis when land is developed adjacent to the MHPA to reduce impacts resulting from construction or operational activities that may degrade the habitat value or disrupt animals within the preserve area and maintain the function of the MHPA. The project would be required to implement the MSCP Land Use Adjacency Guidelines (mitigation measure LU-1) and would not result in cumulative impacts relating to MHPA adjacency.

A boundary line correction (BLC) for MHPA within the project boundary was processed and approved by the Wildlife Agencies on November 17, 2014. The BLC would remove the previously developed portions of the project area (1.09 acres) that were incorrectly mapped as part of the MHPA at the regional scale. The BLC would also add 1.63 acres of coastal sage scrub and 0.23 acre of eucalyptus woodland back into the MHPA; for a net gain of 0.77 acre to the MHPA. Therefore, the project would not result in a significant cumulative impact relative to the MSCP.

The project site is located within the Airport Influence Area of the Marine Corps Air Station (MCAS) Miramar Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP). As discussed in Section 4.1, the project would be consistent with the MCAS ALUCP safety zone, Accident Potential Zone (APZ) II requirements, including land use type and intensity restrictions. The project would also be compatible with the MCAS noise levels. The ALUC has provided a consistency determination for the project and the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) has also issued a determination of no hazard (see Appendix B). Thus, the project would be consistent with the ALUCP and FAA requirements, and would have a less than significant cumulative impact.

# 7.2 Transportation/Circulation

As described in Section 4.2, Transportation/Circulation, the project would net an additional 2,555 average daily trips (ADTs) per day above what the two existing buildings generate. This increase to regional traffic, along with the increase from related projects, would contribute cumulatively to regional traffic congestion in the Horizon Year (2035). Refer to Section 4.2 for the detailed cumulative traffic impact analysis. The project's significant cumulative capacity impacts include:

- Impact TR-2 (cumulative): Campus Point Drive, north of Genesee Avenue
- Impact TR-4 (direct and cumulative): Genesee Avenue/La Jolla Village Drive
- Impact TR-5 (direct and cumulative): Campus Point Drive/Campus Point Court

To mitigate these cumulative traffic impacts, the project would implement mitigation measures TR-2, TR-4, and TR-5. With the implementation of these mitigation measures, the cumulative traffic impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance. As discussed in Sections 4.2 and 7.1 (above), the traffic impacts associated with the Genesee Avenue/Interstate 5 segment and southbound ramps interchange (TR-1 and TR-3) are not cumulative impacts; rather, they are direct impacts which would be fully mitigated once the Caltrans improvements are complete in fall of 2017. Refer to Sections 4.2.3.2 and 4.2.3.3 for additional details.

## 7.3 **Biological Resources**

The City manages its regional biological resources preservation through the adopted MSCP Subarea Plan. The MSCP was designed to compensate for the regional loss of biological resources throughout the region. The project would comply with the MSCP, as detailed in Section 4.1. This includes the MSCP Land Use Adjacency Guidelines that are included as mitigation measure LU-1.

As discussed in Section 4.3, Biological Resources, the project would result in potentially significant impacts to biological resources. Construction impacts to raptors would potentially occur, as the project would remove eucalyptus trees and generate construction noise that could include raptor nests. Also, construction activities would potentially impact migratory bird nests within the limits of disturbance. These potential nesting bird impacts would be mitigated through mitigation measures BIO-1 and LU-1 which require avoidance of the nesting raptor and migratory bird seasons, or nest avoidance measures. All project biological impacts would be mitigated to below a level of significance.

Other projects within the City would also be required to include such avoidance and/or mitigation measures in order to comply with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and the Fish and Game Code. Thus, because both the project and all similar cumulative projects would be required by the City, the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, and the Fish and Game Code to implement preemptive mitigation

measures to avoid impacts to migratory birds and raptors, the project's contribution to a biological impact would not be cumulatively significant.

## 7.4 Historical Resources

Archaeology is a non-renewable resource. Any loss of resources would contribute to a cumulative impact. As addressed in Section 4.4, Historical Resources, the field survey and record search did not locate any resources within the area of potential effect (APE); however, there is potential for significant subsurface cultural deposits in the southern portion of the site on the east side of Campus Point Drive. Therefore, construction of the project has the potential to impact unknown subsurface historical resources in this portion of the site.

Implementation of the mitigation outlined in Section 4.4 (HIST-1) would reduce potential direct impacts to historical resources to below a level of significance. Other projects which involve grading would be conditioned in a similar manner to implement measures that would mitigate potential direct impacts to regionally declining historical resources. Because the project and the past, present, and reasonably foreseeable cumulative projects are consistently required by the City to monitor during grading, the overall cumulative impact to city-wide historical resources would be less than significant. By extension, any single individual project's incremental contribution toward a potential impact to this resource would be less than significant.

## 7.5 Paleontological Resources

The City requires mitigation to address the potential for impacts to paleontological resources. These measures are applied to development projects within geologic formations that have a high and moderate potential for fossils throughout the City and include monitoring during grading, collection, and report preparation. All discretionary projects within the City, including the project, would be reviewed to determine the likelihood of paleontological resources. Projects with potential impacts to paleontological resources would be required to implement mitigation similar to that identified for the proposed project in Section 4.5, Paleontological Resources (PALEO-1), and would reduce cumulative impacts to below a level of significance. This measure would require monitoring and, as necessary, collection, recordation, and curation and documentation of any significant resources to ensure that the project's contribution to cumulative impacts would be less than considerable. Because the project and all cumulative projects would be consistently required by the City to implement similar preemptive mitigation measures, the overall cumulative impact would be less than significant; and by extension, any single individual project's contribution would be less than significant.

## 7.6 Visual Quality/Neighborhood Character

Implementation of the project would result in a change in the visual character of the existing site, but the change would not be considered adverse or incompatible with surrounding uses, as discussed in Section 4.6, Visual Quality/Neighborhood Character. While the project would alter views of the site from Interstate 5, the project would not block any public view corridors or result in a blockage of a public resource from a public viewing area. Development of the project would be compatible with the adjacent development in the project area. Development would relate to existing topographic and landscape features. While development in the project area would result in intensification on a cumulative basis, the project's contribution to impacts associated with public views, community character, and existing landforms would be less than considerable.

# 7.7 Geologic Conditions

The project, as all other projects in the vicinity, would follow standard construction practices and engineering codes to ensure that no geologic impacts would result from project development. Remedial measures identified in project geotechnical investigations, are required by the City's Grading Regulation for all new development within the City. In addition, conformance to building construction standards for seismic safety with the California Building Code would reduce the potential consequences of earthquake ground shaking to an acceptable level of risk. Therefore, because the project and all cumulative projects are consistently required (through the grading regulations and California Building Code) to implement measures which reduce seismic safety risks; the overall cumulative impact would be less than significant.

# 7.8 Health and Safety/Hazardous Materials

Due to the typically localized nature of health and safety impacts and required compliance with regulations, this issue is not typically a cumulative issue by nature. As detailed in Section 8.2, the project would comply with regulations intended to protect health and safety, including brush management requirements, MCAS Miramar ALUCP, FAA Part 77 Noticing, and hazardous material use, transport, handling and disposal requirements. Also, the site is not on a hazardous site listing. Considering that the project and all other cumulative projects would be consistently required to adhere to these regulations, the overall cumulative health and safety/hazardous material impact would be less than significant.

## 7.9 Hydrology

As discussed in Section 8.3, Hydrology, the project would reduce the peak rate of runoff compared to existing conditions. In addition, a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan for construction activities would ensure that site drainage and runoff are controlled. The project would not adversely impact existing drainage patterns, increase runoff, or create flood hazards on-site or downstream.

The standard engineering practices and best management practices (BMPs) of the project have been designed to preclude potential hydrology impacts, including those resulting from drainage into downstream waters. The project would, therefore, not contribute to any cumulative hydrologic effects in the project area. Other projects would be similarly mandated to adhere to state and local engineering requirements and regulations. Thus, because impacts are avoided at the project level, the overall cumulative hydrology impact would be less than significant.

# 7.10 Water Quality

The project would comply with all applicable federal, state, and local water quality standards through adherence to the City's Storm Water Standards. The project design incorporates features to reduce pollutant discharge off-site, thus avoiding significant adverse water quality impacts to the project's receiving waters, Los Peñasquitos Creek, a 303(d) impaired receiving water body. As a result of the installation of water quality measures and BMPs that are not currently present on-site, the project would not have a significant adverse impact on water quality of runoff leaving the site. Through the proposed use of BMPs and Low Impact Development features, implementation of the project would result in water quality impacts that would be improved over the existing condition.

Future projects would also be required to implement these mandated water quality protection measures, and through adherence to the City's National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit, Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan, and Storm Water Standards Manual, would prepare project-specific storm water pollution prevention plans and implement practices that would preclude significant water quality impacts. Implementation of these requirements would avoid potentially significant cumulative impacts. Water quality is discussed further in Section 8.4, Water Quality.

# 7.11 Air Quality

As a regional issue, the cumulative study area for air quality impacts encompasses the San Diego Air Basin (SDAB) as a whole. Therefore, the cumulative analysis is focused on project's contribution towards SDAB air quality issues and the associated regional air quality plans and policies, such as the RAQS.

As discussed in Section 8.5, the project would be consistent with the land use designations in the General Plan and growth assumptions in the RAQS. The project is within an area designated for scientific research and development use in the UCP. Therefore, the project would not conflict with the RAQS, the regional plan for addressing air quality within the SDAB, and would not contribute to a cumulative impact associated with the RAQS. Thus, the project's incremental increase in emissions would not be cumulatively significant.

The SDAB is listed as nonattainment for particulates and ozone. The project would have a less than significant contribution to this significant cumulative particulate and ozone air quality issue, as the project's contribution would be below the National Ambient Air Quality Standards emission thresholds (see Section 8.5; Appendix I). The project would implement standard dust control measures in compliance with SDAPCD rules and regulations. The other cumulative projects in the SDAB would similarly be required to implement standard dust control measures and control air pollutant emissions in compliance with the SDAPCD requirements.

## 7.12 Noise

In the project vicinity, cumulative noise impacts would generally be attributed to increases in traffic volumes. As presented in Section 8.6, Noise, the project has the potential to contribute traffic to area

roadways. An increase of 3 dB is considered a perceptible increase in noise. Therefore, a significant impact would occur if project implementation would expose on- or off-site, existing, and planned sensitive uses to road noise 3 dB over existing noise levels. The noise analysis shows that on a cumulative basis, the project would result in future cumulative noise increases that are less than 3 dB at all roadway segments. Thus, existing uses in the project vicinity would not be exposed to a significant cumulative increase in noise. In addition, the project and all cumulative projects would be required to adhere to the City's noise ordinance. As such, the project would not contribute to a significant cumulative noise level increase, and impacts would be less than significant.

# 7.13 Public Services and Utilities

## 7.13.1 Public Services

Public services and facilities include many population-based uses, including schools, libraries, and parks, as well as police and fire protection. No cumulatively significant impacts to public services and facilities (including transportation facilities) would occur because the project would be required to pay development impact fees at the building permit stage. Further, the project is located within an area of the University Community Planning Area (CPA) that is developed and contains the necessary police and fire rescue infrastructure. The project does not propose housing and, therefore, would not result in an increase in population; thus, the project would not contribute to a cumulative demand to schools, libraries, and parks.

Other future development within the University CPA would be required to ensure adequate police and fire-rescue services are available at the time individual projects come forward, similar to the project. Additionally, future residential projects would be required to mitigate any impacts to population-based resources, such as schools, libraries, and parks by paying any applicable impact fees prior to issuance of building permits. These requirements would ensure that no cumulative impacts to public services and facilities would occur because the project, as well as the cumulative projects, would preclude their impacts through the payment of impact fees.

## 7.13.2 Public Utilities

#### 7.13.2.1 Water, Wastewater, and Storm Water

Water, wastewater, and storm water system utilities exist at the project site and adjacent to the site. As the project would not increase runoff flow rates to these facilities, the project would have no cumulative impact to storm water systems. The project would increase the demand for water and wastewater at the site. As indicated in Section 8.7, the project would include on-site utility improvements and there is adequate capacity in the off-site utility system to serve the proposed project in addition to the existing demand. Thus, the project's cumulative utility impact would be less than significant. As other projects would also be required to demonstrate compliance with City policies relative to public utilities, no cumulative impacts would occur.

#### 7.13.2.2 Solid Waste

The project would generate additional solid waste through construction and ongoing operations of the increased research and development facility. In conjunction with past, present, and future projects, the project would increase the amount of solid waste generated within the region. All landfills within the San Diego region are approaching capacity and due to close within the next 3 to 20 years. Given the waste reduction target of 75 percent, the majority of waste must be handled at facilities other than landfills. Currently there is insufficient capacity for organic materials collection, diversion, and processing required by state law under Assembly Bill 1826.

All discretionary projects exceeding the City's significance thresholds are required to prepare a waste management plan (WMP) and demonstrate how they can achieve a 75 percent waste reduction. Future development is also subject to the City Recycling Ordinance, which requires the provision of on-site recycling services and educational materials. The project is pursuing Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Silver certification, and would include waste management and sustainability measures to reduce waste disposed of in landfills (see Appendix L and Section 3.3.8). Cumulative impacts are associated with ongoing waste generation and are considered significant if they could exceed 60 tons per year. Implementation of the Waste Management Plan in Appendix K would mitigate both direct and cumulative impacts associated with this project.

# 7.14 Agricultural Resources

The project site does not contain Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, or Unique Farmland as designated by the California Department of Conservation, nor is the project site subject to, or near, a Williamson Act contract parcel. Therefore, project development would have no cumulative effect on agricultural resources.

## 7.15 Mineral Resources

As discussed in Section 8.9, the site consists of a research and development facility surrounding by MHPA and other developments. Due to this, there is no potential to use the site for mineral extraction operations. Thus, the project would have no cumulative impact to mineral resources.

# 7.16 Energy Conservation

Project design features would ensure that the proposed project would not result in the excessive use of electric power, fuel, or other forms of energy. These features include LEED Silver certification for the project's structures, compliance with the goals in the General Plan's Conservation Element, and the installation of water- and energy-saving systems. Energy conservation is discussed further in detail in Section 8.10, Energy Conservation. Considering these features, the project would have a less than significant cumulative energy impact.

# 7.17 Population and Housing

The project involves adding additional research and development within an existing facility. The project is not large enough to induce growth through an increase in employment population, would not displace housing or population, and would not affect any existing housing. Therefore, the project would have no cumulative impact to population and housing.

# 8

# Chapter 8 Subject Areas Requiring No Change from 1993 EIR

Pursuant to California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15163, the analysis and conclusions reached in several of the environmental subject areas contained within the 1993 FEIR do not require supplemental analysis and are not addressed in further detail in this SEIR. This is because the project would not result in changes affecting the analysis in the 1993 FEIR, as there were no substantial changes in circumstances or new information available with respect to each subject area that would trigger a need for supplemental review (CEQA Guidelines Section 15162). These subject areas include:

- Geologic Conditions
- Health and Safety/Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology
- Water Quality
- Air Quality
- Noise
- Public Services and Utilities
- Agricultural Resources
- Mineral Resources
- Energy Conservation
- Population and Housing

Any future environmental review related to these subjects shall be required to refer to the 1993 EIR.

## 8.1 Geologic Conditions

The 1993 FEIR concluded that there were no significant soil or geologic conditions present that would preclude development of the site. The analysis went on to state that there were no active

faults on-site or areas of groundwater perching; nor would there be any erosion issues as standard erosion control measures would be implemented during grading. GEOCON, Inc. conducted a comprehensive geotechnical and geologic fault investigation of the project site (June 11, 2015), included as Appendix F-1 of this SEIR, in order to substantiate the consistency of this SEIR with the previous environmental documentation. Based on Appendix F-1, there are no substantial changes with respect to the circumstances under which the project is being undertaken; nor is there substantial new information which could not have been previously known. However, while there were no previous mitigation measures listed in the 1993 FEIR relative to geologic conditions, the GEOCON report (see Appendix F-1) includes standard design considerations which would become conditions of project approval. The detailed project-specific geologic analysis based on the 2015 geotechnical survey is provided in the following paragraphs.

#### 8.1.1 Geologic Conditions and Soils

The San Diego area is located in the Peninsular Ranges Physiographic Province of southwestern California. In San Diego County, the coastal plain runs parallel to the coast flanking the Peninsular Range and is characterized by a broad wedge of Tertiary sedimentary deposits that thicken from east to west capped by Quaternary marine terrace deposits. The site is underlain by Tertiary-age Ardath and Scripps formations. Overall, therefore, the project site does not contain geologic units or soils that may be unstable for development.

The project site is located within Geologic Hazard Categories 12, 25, and 52 as shown on the City's Seismic Safety Study maps. Category 12 includes faults that are potentially active, inactive, presumed inactive, or activity unknown. Category 25 is characterized by slide-prone formations. Category 52 is characterized by favorable geologic structure and low risk of geologic hazards. Geologic impacts associated with earthquakes can be classified as fault-rupture, ground shaking, and secondary effects such as soil liquefaction and slope instability. The risk associated with ground rupture hazard is low due to the absence of active faults on the property. Additionally, the risk associated with liquefaction hazard is low for the site due to the dense nature of the underlying sediments and the lack of permanent, near-surface groundwater. The potential for a landslide is also low.

Grading and development of the project would be controlled by the California Building Code, as well as the City Municipal Code, which requires conformance with recommendations provided in the geotechnical investigation for the project. Potential impacts of earthquake shaking on the proposed structures would be reduced to an acceptable level by design and construction in accordance with prevailing building codes, as discussed in the geotechnical investigation.

#### 8.1.2 Erosion

The City Municipal Code's Grading Regulations require measures to control erosion during and after grading or construction. Conformance with such mandated City grading requirements would ensure that proposed grading and construction operations would avoid significant soil erosion impacts. In addition, grading shall follow recommendations described in the geotechnical investigation to avoid potential soil erosion impacts.

In summary, compliance with state and City regulations and the geotechnical investigation recommendations would ensure that impacts due to geologic conditions, soil erosion, and earthquakes would be less than significant.

## 8.2 Health and Safety/Hazardous Materials

The 1993 FEIR analyzed Safety and Hazardous Materials in Section 4.5. As discussed therein, the previous project was not anticipated to have any significant impacts due to the use, storage, or manufacture of hazardous materials, provided each on-site use obtains and implements a Hazardous Materials Business Plan. Further, the 1993 FEIR concludes that implementation of the brush management plan would preclude significant fire hazards. The following discussions substantiate the fact that the project would be consistent with the 1993 FEIR, that there is no substantial new information available, no substantial changes in circumstances, and that the project would not subject future users of the site to safety impacts beyond what was addressed in the previous environmental document.

### 8.2.1 Wildfire Safety

The project site is subject to risk of wildfire due to its location adjacent to natural open space and presence of steep slopes and vegetation fuel on-site. The Land Development Code (LDC; Section 142.0412) requires that brush management zones (BMZ) be established adjacent to development to reduce the risk from wildland fires; the requirements apply to premises that are within 100 feet of a habitable structure and contain native or naturalized vegetation. The purpose of such a program is to reduce the risk of wildfire while minimizing visual, biological, and erosion impacts to natural areas. Two brush management zones are typically included. BMZ-1 typically consists of brush clearance (native species shall be regularly pruned to reduce excessive fuel) and ornamental plantings (including native plant species) with permanent irrigation. BMZ-2 typically involves the selective thinning and pruning of native vegetation. Brush management is based on standard zone widths of 35 feet for BMZ-1 and 65 feet for BMZ-2. The Brush Management Regulations state that a site-specific brush management plan use creative site design and/or structural design to minimize impacts to undisturbed native vegetation.

As shown in Figure 3-3, a brush management plan has been prepared for the project in compliance with the requirements of the LDC and San Diego Fire Prevention Bureau Policy B-08-1. Given the brush management plan and compliance with San Diego's brush management regulations and San Diego Fire Prevention Bureau Policy B-08-1 requirements, the level of risk associated with potential wildfires would be less than significant.

## 8.2.2 Airport Hazards

An Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) was adopted for Marine Corps Air Station (MCAS) Miramar in 2008. The project site lies approximately four miles to the northwest of MCAS Miramar and is within the Airport Influence Area (AIA; for the policies and criteria) and Accident Potential Zone (APZ) II, which is a designated risk area due to the potential for aircraft accidents. The MCAS Miramar ALUCP identifies the usage intensity as the primary indicator for risk exposure to people from an aircraft accident and has established a maximum usage intensity of 50 persons per acre for non-residential uses within the APZ-II. The project has a calculated usage intensity of less than 50 persons per acre based on the alternative calculation method provided for in the MCAS Miramar ALUCP and San Diego LDC. Due to compliance with MCAS Miramar ALUCP, the level of impacts associated with the safety hazard of the MCAS Miramar AIA, would be less than significant.

The project site is also within the FAA Part 77 Noticing Area for MCAS Miramar. The project would not penetrate the Part 77 100:1 notification surface area, as the difference between the lowest Part 77 notification surface and the highest elevation of grade equals 300 feet, and no structures are proposed more than 197 feet above grade. Furthermore, the project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working within two miles of a private airstrip or a private airport or heliport facility that is not covered by an adopted ALUCP. The nearest private heliport facility is the Qualcomm Helipad, which is approximately two miles from the project site. Therefore, the people working at the proposed project would not be subject to any safety risks associated with this issue. No impacts would occur.

#### 8.2.3 Hazardous Materials

According to the State Water Resources Control Board's (SWRCB) GeoTracker database, along with the California Department of Toxic Substances Control's EnviroStor database, the project would not be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. Therefore, the project would not create a significant hazard to the public or environment. Impacts would be less than significant. Although the project site is located in proximity to the University of California, San Diego (UCSD), the proposed project would not result in hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within a quarter mile of UCSD facilities. No impacts would occur.

# 8.3 Hydrology

As described in the hydrology section of the 1993 FEIR, the conditions that existed at that time were such that the runoff entered a storm drain along the western project boundary, which connected to drainage improvements along I-5. Runoff from the undeveloped portion of the site drains either down the slopes to the west or into the improved storm drain system to the south. Eventually, all surface runoff from the project site drains into Los Peñasquitos Lagoon. The 1993 EIR states that the proposed development would include a storm drain system designed to handle the increased runoff resulting from the additional imperious surfaces; the FEIR then concludes that the existing and proposed drainage facilities would be adequate to accommodate the anticipated runoff and that no significant hydrologic impacts would occur.

In order to update the SEIR with the current hydrologic conditions and regulatory standards, a hydrology and hydraulic study (Appendix G; September 29, 2016) and stormwater quality management plan (Appendix H; October 25, 2016) were prepared by Michael Baker International. The water quality study includes hydrologic calculations and analysis as part of its content. Various federal, state, and local regulations impose requirements on new development for runoff control and drainage. This includes the Clean Water Act, Federal Emergency Management Agency flooding

regulations, Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act and associated California Water Code, and the City of San Diego Municipal Code. The Regional Water Quality Boards (RWQCBs) implement and enforce provisions of the California Water Code and the Clean Water Act. The project would be subject to the SWRCB Construction General Permit Order 2009-0009 through the City. Additionally, because the storm water discharges into the City of San Diego's Municipal Separate Stormwater Sewer System (MS4), the project must meet the requirements of the City of San Diego Storm Water Quality Manual.

#### 8.3.1 Drainage

The drainage study (see Appendix G) prepared for the project compares the hydrologic properties of the project site's existing flows to the proposed flows. According to the drainage study, the existing peak rate of runoff rate (54.86 cubic feet per second [cfs]) would be reduced to 28.78 cfs under the proposed project conditions (Table 8-1). This reduction is attributed to implementing hydromodification best management practices (BMPs) within the project's two drainage basins (Basins A and B) including underground storm drain, catch basins, curb inlets, and biofiltration basins (see Appendix G for additional details). Specifically, the proposed drainage system would consist of a system of catch basins and PVC and HDPE pipes as well as two pump stations.

The pump stations, one located in the northwest corner of the project and one located to the southwest corner of the project, would pump the storm drainage to the proposed infiltration basin. The infiltration basin will infiltrate the flows from the majority of the site (Basin A), with approximately 61 percent of the runoff being infiltrated. Basin B includes a portion of the road not being constructed under the Boulevard project, a ministerial project that is being processed under a separate permit. This roadway drains to a biofiltration basin which uses passive infiltration. The passive infiltration does not meet the 85th percentile requirement; accordingly, it has been designed as a partial infiltration basin. A geotechnical addendum letter is attached to this EIR as Appendix F-2 (GEOCON; September 28, 2016) which supports the feasibility of partial (but not full) infiltration. Because the use of the project does not change from commercial to commercial, there is no change in runoff co-efficient. With no change in runoff co-efficient and area, it is anticipated that the runoff will not change.

As shown in Table 8-1, the post-project condition flows are drastically reduced compared to the existing condition. Approximately 71 percent of runoff is infiltrated in Basin B and 61 percent in Basin A.

Table 8-1 Proposed Project Runoff Rates (100-year, 6-hour peak flow rates)							
Basin Existing Conditions Proposed Project							
Management	Basin Area	Runoff	Basin Area	Runoff			
Area	(acres)	(cfs)	(acres)	(cfs)	Difference		
А	11.09	53.44	11.09	26.29	-27.15		
В	0.52	1.42	0.52	2.49	+1.07		
TOTAL	11.61	54.86	11.61	28.78	-26.08		
cfs = cubic feet per second.							

Runoff will ultimately be discharged from the project site at the same location as the existing condition, to the existing cleanout at the southwest corner of the project site. Proposed improvements will not increase the total peak flow runoff, as compared to existing conditions, because the project would remove pavement and install additional landscaping. Since the pervious area would not be increased from the pre-project condition and the flows would be reduced by as much as 99 percent through the use of pervious areas, an infiltration basin, and a biofiltration basin, no downstream impacts would occur.

While there is not a significant concern for erosion as the site is previously developed, the potential for erosion would be reduced by following the Erosion Control Plan (part of the Rough Grading Plans). Runoff would flow over relatively flat areas where scour would not be a concern. Runoff is not proposed over any sloped areas.

The implementation of the project would result in a decrease in impervious area and a decrease in runoff rates relative to the existing conditions. Implementation of project design measures and conformance with federal, state, and local regulations would effectively avoid and/or address potentially significant short- and long-term impacts related to hydrology. During construction and operation, the project would implement BMPs to control runoff rates. Thus, impacts to runoff would be less than significant.

Hydromodification applicability was determined using Figure 1 of the Storm Water Standards, "HMP Applicability Determination" (see Appendix G). The reduction of impervious areas by 1.27 acres increases the total pervious area from 35 percent (existing) to 80 percent (proposed). Accordingly, the hydrology report (see Appendix G) concludes that the project would not be exempt from hydromodification. Overall, drainage patterns would be similar to the existing conditions and runoff rates would be reduced. Thus, the project would not result in a substantial alteration to drainage.

## 8.4 Water Quality

As described in the hydrology/water quality section of the 1993 FEIR, development of the project would result in an increase in the amount of urban pollutants. The discussion focuses on the cumulative water quality impact to the Los Peñasquitos Lagoon. The FEIR states that the increase in impervious surface area would cause additional harmful materials such as oil, rubber, metals, pathogens, trash, and other solid wastes to adversely affect the water quality in the lagoon. In addition, landscaping fertilizer and pesticides would contribute incrementally to a cumulatively significant increase in the amount and concentrations of urban pollutants in the Los Peñasquitos Lagoon. The 1993 FEIR goes on to conclude that impacts would be significant and require mitigation in the form of a program to manage and control nonpoint source pollution. The plan specifies that the mitigation must include practices in accordance with design criteria in effect in San Diego at the time including detention ponds, grass swales, and wetland creation.

Because the regulatory environment as it pertains to water quality has changed since the 1993 FEIR was certified, the following discussion summarizes the water quality report which was prepared by Michael Baker International (November 2015), and is included as Appendix H to this SEIR.

## 8.4.1 Construction

While construction details are unknown at this time, a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) would be required to be prepared prior to construction in conformance with SWRCB Construction General Permit Order 2009-0009. The SWPPP would include BMPs to control site runoff volumes and reduce the potential for contaminated runoff. BMPs may include solid waste management, spill prevention and control, concrete waste management, water conservation practices, paving and grinding operations, and the designation of material storage and stockpile areas. Runoff controls would likely include the use of silt fences, fiber rolls, gravel bag berms, sandbag barriers, storm drain inlet protection, stabilized construction entrances, frequent street sweeping, and/or protection of disturbed areas. Ultimately, compliance with federal, state, and local regulations at the time of construction would ensure runoff impacts during construction are less than significant.

#### 8.4.2 Pollutant Discharge - Operations

Water quality may be affected by sedimentation caused by erosion, runoff carrying contaminants, and direct discharge of pollutants. Land development generally leads to increased opportunity for contaminated runoff that carries oil, heavy metals, pesticides, fertilizers, and other contaminants to enter a watershed. Primary pollutants of concern are those that correspond with any Clean Water Act 303(d) designation for the receiving waters and the anticipated pollutants generated from the project. This project's receiving waters include the Los Peñasquitos Creek, the Los Peñasquitos Lagoon, and the Pacific Ocean. Los Peñasquitos Creek is listed as impaired due to enterococcus, fecal coliform, selenium, total dissolved solids, nitrogen, and toxicity, while Los Peñasquitos Lagoon is listed as impaired due to sedimentation and siltation.

To meet the City's water quality requirements, the project design incorporates a combination of water quality measures to reduce pollutant discharge into the Los Peñasquitos Creek and Los Peñasquitos Lagoon. The project includes site design and source control BMPs to reduce the generation of potential pollutants and to reduce exposure of storm water to pollutants. In addition, the project includes low impact development strategies and treatment control BMPs to treat polluted storm water runoff to the maximum extent practicable before it exits the site. Specifically, the proposed drainage system directs runoff from building roofs and the pavement to an infiltration basin, where it would be allowed to pond and filter through the soil. Flows that are not able to infiltrate are filtered through a proprietary Biofiltration System. The Biofiltration System has a high treatment category for sediment and heavy metals, which are pollutants of concern for the downstream receiving water. As a result of the installation of water quality measures and BMPs that are not currently present on-site, the project would improve the quality of runoff leaving the site.

Overall, the project would incorporate BMPs and project design features to reduce pollutant discharge off-site, thus avoiding significant adverse water quality impacts to the Los Peñasquitos Creek, a 303(d) impaired receiving water body. The geotechnical report does not recommend infiltration for the project, and infiltration is not proposed. The long-term operation of the project would not create any direct significant impacts associated with siltation and sedimentation. The project would comply with all applicable federal, state, and local water quality standards through

adherence to the City's Storm Water Standards and the General Construction Permit. Implementation of the proposed BMPs described above would reduce potential impacts to water quality to less than significant.

## 8.5 Air Quality

The 1993 FEIR identified significant direct and cumulative air quality impacts due to localized traffic generation. Relative to direct (operational) air quality impacts, the 1993 FEIR concluded that the project would significantly impact local air quality by causing three intersections to drop below LOS C and that no mitigation measures were available (at that time) to maintain LOS C or better at those intersections. As compared to the conditions that existed at the time that the 1993 FEIR was certified, traffic impacts have been reduced. The three intersections found to be significantly impacted in the 1993 FEIR included the Genesee Avenue intersections at Regents Road, Eastgate Mall, and Campus Point Drive; all of which were found to be less than significant in the current traffic study. Further, all of the proposed project's traffic impacts are mitigable, with the exception of the Genesee/Interstate 5 improvements which will be mitigated once the improvements are completed in the fall of 2017.

Notwithstanding the fact that traffic impacts, and correspondingly the air quality circumstances, have been reduced during the interim time period, a project-specific air quality report has been prepared in order to document the improved circumstances of the project's air quality setting as well as substantiate a conclusion that the proposed project's air quality impacts would be both less than significant and reduced as compared to those previously identified in the 1993 FEIR. This air quality technical report was completed by RECON in November 2015 (see Appendix I) and is summarized below.

#### 8.5.1 Air Quality Plan Implementation

The California Clean Air Act requires areas that are designated as non-attainment of state ambient air quality standards for ozone, carbon monoxide (CO), sulfur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>), and nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>) to prepare and implement plans to attain the standards by the earliest practicable date. The San Diego Air Basin (SDAB) is designated non-attainment for the state ozone standard. Accordingly, the Regional Air Quality Standards (RAQS) was developed to identify feasible emission control measures and provide expeditious progress toward attaining the state standards for ozone. The two pollutants addressed in the RAQS are reactive organic gases (ROG) and NO<sub>x</sub>, which are precursors to the formation of ozone. Projected increases in motor vehicle usage, population, and growth create challenges in controlling emissions and by extension to maintaining and improving air quality. The RAQS, in conjunction with the transportation control measure (TCM), were most recently adopted in 2009 as the air quality plan for the region.

The California Air Resources Board (CARB) mobile source emission projections and San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) growth projections are based on population, vehicle trends, and land use plans developed in general plans. As such, projects that propose development that is consistent with the growth anticipated by SANDAG's growth projections and/or the general plan would be consistent with the RAQS. In the event that a project would propose development that is less dense than anticipated by the growth projections, the project would likewise be consistent with the RAQS. In the event a project proposes development that is greater than anticipated in the growth projections, further analysis would be warranted to determine if the project would exceed the growth projections used in the RAQS for the specific subregional area.

The project site is designated Industrial Employment and Open Space in the General Plan, and as Scientific Research and Open Space by the University Community Plan (UCP). The proposed scientific research and development use on the site would be consistent with these land use designations of Industrial Employment and Scientific Research. As such, the project would be consistent with regional growth projections and the RAQS. Additionally, the project would support the goal of smart growth principles related to providing infill compact development with provisions for increased energy efficiency, low water use in the indoor and outdoor environments, and the goal to achieve Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) silver certification. Therefore, the project would be consistent with the City General Plan and the growth assumptions used in the development of the RAQS/State Implementation Plan (SIP). Because the project would not conflict with, or obstruct implementation of, these plans, impacts would be less than significant.

## 8.5.2 Air Quality Standards and Violations

Stationary sources of air pollution are regulated by the San Diego Air Pollution Control District (SDAPCD) and are defined as any non-vehicular article, machine, equipment, contrivance, process, or process line which emits any air contaminant sources. The project would entail research and development uses which would not result in significant stationary sources of emissions and therefore would not violate air quality regulations.

Construction-related pollutants result from dust raised during demolition and grading, emissions from construction vehicles, and chemicals used during construction. Emissions associated with construction of this project were calculated using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod). For assessing the significance of the air quality emissions resulting during construction of the project, the construction emissions were compared to the SDAPCD trigger levels. These thresholds are designed to provide limits below which project emissions would not significantly change regional air quality. As shown in Table 4 of the Air Quality Report (see Appendix I), project construction would not exceed the applicable regional emissions thresholds. Therefore, as project emissions that would exceed the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) or California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS) or contribute to existing violations. Additionally, construction emissions would be temporary, intermittent, and would cease at the end of project construction.

Long-term emissions of regional air pollutants occur from operational sources. Mobile source emissions would originate from traffic generated by the project. Area source emissions would result from activities such as the use of natural gas and consumer products. In addition, landscaping maintenance activities associated with the proposed land uses would produce pollutant emissions. Operational emissions due to implementation of the project were calculated using CalEEMod. As shown in Table 5 of the air quality report (see Appendix I), project operation would not exceed the applicable regional emissions thresholds. These thresholds are designed to provide limits below which project emissions would not significantly change regional air quality. Therefore, as project emissions are well below these limits, project operations would not result in regional emissions that would exceed the NAAQS or CAAQS or contribute to existing violations. Therefore, the project would result in a less than significant impact.

### 8.5.3 Cumulatively Considerable Increase in Criteria Pollutants

The region is classified as attainment for all criterion pollutants except ozone, 10-micron particulate matter ( $PM_{10}$ ), and 2.5-micron particulate matter ( $PM_{2.5}$ ). The SDAB is non-attainment for the 8-hour federal and state ozone standards. Ozone is not emitted directly, but is a result of atmospheric activity on precursors. NO<sub>X</sub> and ROG are known as the chief "precursors" of ozone. These compounds react in the presence of sunlight to produce ozone.

As shown in Tables 4 and 5 of the Air Quality Report (see Appendix I) and summarized in Section 8.5.2, emissions of ozone precursors (ROG and NO<sub>X</sub>),  $PM_{10}$ , and  $PM_{2.5}$  from construction and operation would be below the applicable thresholds. Therefore, the project would not generate emissions in quantities that would result in an exceedance of the NAAQS or CAAQS for ozone,  $PM_{10}$ , or  $PM_{2.5}$ , and impacts would be less than significant.

#### 8.5.4 Localized Carbon Monoxide Impacts

Small-scale, localized concentrations of CO above the state and national standards have the potential to occur near stagnation points of heavily traveled intersections. Localized, high concentrations of CO are referred to as "CO hot spots." CO hot spots can occur when projects contribute traffic to area intersections. CO hot spots almost exclusively occur near intersections with a LOS E or worse in combination with relatively high traffic volumes on all roadways. A CO hot spot analysis was performed at two signalized intersections where, with the addition of the project, the delay at these intersections would increase and the intersections would operate at LOS E or worse. These intersections are at Genesee Avenue and the Interstate 5 southbound ramp, and Genesee Avenue and La Jolla Village Drive. Appendix I estimates the maximum 1-hour concentration would be 5.7 ppm. It was also calculated that the maximum 8-hour concentration would be 4.0 ppm. These concentrations would be below the federal and state 1-hour and 8-hour standards; therefore, no significant localized CO impacts would occur at area intersections as a result of the project.

## 8.5.5 Particulate Matter, Air Toxics, and Odors

Project construction would include grading and soil excavation. Standard dust control during grading operations would be implemented to reduce potential nuisance impacts and to ensure compliance with SDAPCD rules and regulations. Specific construction modeling parameters can be found in the Air Quality Report (see Appendix I). As detailed in Appendix I, the total projected construction maximum daily emission levels for each criteria pollutant is projected to be less than the applicable thresholds for all criteria pollutants. Construction impacts would, therefore, be less than significant with implementation of standard dust control measures during grading.

The project is a research facility and would not generate air toxics. Therefore, the project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, including air toxics such as diesel particulates. Impacts would be less than significant.

Odor generators generally include restaurants, dry cleaners, and certain heavy industrial uses; however, there are no known significant odor generators within or near the project site; nor are there any known sources of specific, long-term odors, such as wastewater treatment plants, landfills, transfer stations, or animal rendering facilities in the project vicinity. The project consists of research facilities and would not generate objectionable odors or to be located adjacent to a known odor generator.

## 8.6 Noise

The 1993 FEIR analyzed the project's potential to expose future tenants to noise resulting from automobiles and aircraft. In light of the changes to CEQA as a result of interpretations by the court, this would be considered "CEQA-in-reverse" by today's practitioners. Notwithstanding the changes to noise analysis methodology since the 1993 FEIR was certified, noise impacts to future tenants were determined to be less than significant. The 1993 FEIR concludes that the cumulative traffic noise resulting from the additional traffic added to the community and regional roadways would be significant and not mitigable.

Similar to what was discussed in Section 8.5 above (Air Quality), traffic impacts have been reduced during the time period since 1993 and the circumstances of the project's noise setting have correspondingly improved. Therefore, a project-specific noise technical report has been prepared in order to substantiate a conclusion that the proposed project's noise impacts would be less than significant and reduced as compared to those previously identified in the 1993 FEIR. This noise technical report was completed by RECON in November 2015 (Appendix J) and is summarized below. The following discussion evaluates the potential for a significant increase in ambient noise levels because of future vehicle traffic on Interstate 5, Genesee Drive, and Campus Point Drive; on-site generated noise; and construction noise impacts to adjacent receivers.

#### 8.6.1 Ambient Noise Level Increase

Existing ambient noise levels in the project area are generated by traffic on area roadways and other noise associated with a given land use. The project would contribute traffic to area roadways, which would in turn increase the ambient noise level. An increase of 3 dB is considered a perceptible increase in noise. Therefore, a significant impact would occur if project implementation would expose on- or off-site, existing, and planned sensitive uses to road noise 3 dB over existing noise levels.

Table 8-2 shows the existing traffic volumes with and without the project, the near-term traffic volumes with and without the project, the Year 2035 traffic volumes with and without the project, and the associated increases in noise levels. As shown in Table 8-2, adding project-generated traffic to existing traffic volumes would increase noise levels by 0.0 to 1.7 dB. Adding project-generated

Table 8-2 Traffic Noise Level Increases										
Roadway Segment	Existing ADT	Existing + Project ADT	Increase in dB	Near-term ADT	Near-term + Project ADT	Increase in dB	2035 ADT	2035 + Project ADT	Increase in dB	Cumulative (Existing to Year 2035 + Project ADT)
Genesee Avenue					,					
I-5 SB Ramps to I-5 NB Ramps	39,850	40,591	0.1	44,758	45,499	0.1	53,800	54,541	0.1	1.4
I-5 NB Ramps to Scripps Hospital	38,814	39,785	0.1	45,084	46,055	0.1	53,228	54,199	0.1	1.5
Scripps Hospital to Campus Point Drive	33,993	34,989	0.1	40,386	41,382	0.1	42,900	43,896	0.1	1.1
Campus Point Drive to Regents Road	30,602	31,803	0.2	37,608	38,809	0.1	43,400	44,601	0.1	1.6
Regents Road to Eastgate Mall	28,038	28,983	0.1	33,218	34,163	0.1	37,700	38,645	0.1	1.4
Eastgate Mall to Executive Drive	25,884	26,574	0.1	30,946	31,636	0.1	33,299	33,989	0.1	1.2
Executive Drive to La Jolla Village Drive	26,998	27,432	0.1	31,791	32,225	0.1	38,079	38,513	0.0	1.5
Campus Point Drive										
Genesee Avenue to Campus Point Court	11,117	13,570	0.9	11,148	13,601	0.9	21,300	23,753	0.5	3.3
North of Campus Point Court	5,388	7,943	1.7	5,419	7,974	1.7	6,000	8,555	1.5	2.0

traffic to near-term traffic volumes would increase noise levels by 0.0 to 1.7 dB, and adding projectgenerated traffic to Year 2035 traffic volumes would increase noise levels by 0.0 to 1.5 dB. Noise increases due to the project in the existing, near-term, and 2035 conditions would be less than 3 dB. When comparing existing to year 2035 plus project traffic volumes, a 3.3 dB increase would occur at Campus Point Drive between Genesee Avenue and Campus Point Court. However, there are no sensitive receptors located adjacent to this segment. Additionally, existing noise levels in the vicinity of this roadway segment are 56.1 A-weighted decibels average sound levels (dB(A) L<sub>eq</sub>) (see Measurement 1). With the addition of 3.3 dB, noise levels would not exceed the significance thresholds. Therefore, cumulative and direct impacts would be less than significant. The project would not result in or create a significant increase in the existing ambient noise levels. Cumulative ambient noise increase impacts would likewise be less than significant.

#### 8.6.2 Noise Exposure

The Noise Abatement and Control Ordinance specifies maximum one-hour average sound level limits at the boundary of a property. These maximum one-hour sound level limits are the maximum noise levels allowed at any point on or beyond the property boundaries due to activities occurring on the property. Where two or more zones adjoin, the sound level limit is the arithmetic mean of the respective limits for the two zones. Table 8-3 shows the exterior noise limits specified in the City's Noise Control Ordinance.

Table 8-3 Exterior Noise Limits						
	Noise Level [dB(A)]					
	7:00 a.m. to	7:00 p.m. to	10:00 p.m. to			
Receiving Land Use Category	7:00 p.m.	10:00 p.m.	7:00 a.m.			
Single Dwelling Unit Residential	50	45	40			
Multi-dwelling Unit Residential						
(up to a maximum density of	55	50	45			
1 dwelling unit/2,000 square feet)						
All Other Residential	60	55	50			
Commercial	65	60	60			
Industrial or Agricultural	75	75	75			

The project site and the properties located to the south and west are both zoned Industrial Park IP-1-1. The IP-1-1 zone allows for research and development uses with some limited manufacturing. The properties to the west and northwest and zoned Industrial – Light (IL-3-1), which allows for a wide range of manufacturing and distribution activities.

The applicable noise limits between the project site and the neighboring industrial area is 75 dB(A)  $L_{eq}$  any time of the day.

#### 8.6.2.1 Stationary Noise

The project would include stationary sources of noise such as the parking garage, mechanical equipment, and loading docks. The following is a discussion of the stationary noise sources associated with each building.

**Building CP1:** Building CP1 is an existing building, and no new mechanical equipment or other sources of stationary noise would be constructed or installed at this building. Thus, Building CP1 was not included in this analysis.

**Building CP2:** The project would include the construction of two loading docks to the west of Building CP2. The loading dock noise sources include truck drive-by noise, truck loading/unloading, and truck engine noise. Average hourly noise levels would equate to 60.5 dB(A)  $L_{eq}$  at a distance of 25 feet for each loading dock. An equipment yard would also be located west of Building CP2. The equipment in the yard would include natural gas tanks, storage, and an eye wash station. None of these would be a significant source of stationary noise.

**Building CP3:** Building CP3 is a 12-story structure that would be equipped with heating, ventilation and air conditioning (HVAC) equipment within the building at each floor. Smaller air handlers and exhaust systems would be located on the roof and screened from view. It is not known at this time which manufacturer, brand, or model of unit or units will be selected for use in the project. Based on review of various manufacturer specifications for example units, a representative noise level for a 20-ton unit would be a sound power level of 92 dB. Based on the mechanical design of Building CP2 and the square footage of Building CP3, it was assumed that 16 units would be required.

A loading dock and utility area would be located south of Building CP3. Noise associated with this area would be similar to the noise associated with the loading dock and equipment area located adjacent to Building CP2.

**Building CP4:** Building CP4 would consist of a brewery, restaurant, and market. Brewery equipment would be primarily located inside the proposed building. Noise levels measurements at an existing Karl Strauss brewery indicate that individual pieces of equipment would generate noise levels between 50 and 70 dB(A)  $L_{eq}$  at a distance of 5 feet (Ryan Companies US 2015). These noise levels are equivalent to a sound power level range of 62 to 82 dB(A) sound power ( $L_{pw}$ ). Due to the noise attenuation provided by standard construction (-40 to -50 dB), indoor equipment is not anticipated to result in noise impacts at adjacent property lines.

Building CP4 would also require rooftop HVAC equipment. As with Building CP3, it is not known at this time which manufacturer, brand, or model of unit or units will be selected for use in the project. It was assumed a 20-ton unit with a sound power level of 92 dB would be required.

**Parking Garage:** The proposed parking garage would be a source of noise. Activities making up a single parking event included vehicle arrival, limited idling, occupants exiting a vehicle, door closures, conversations among passengers, occupants entering a vehicle, startup of a vehicle, and departure of a vehicle. The parking area was modeled based on a typical vehicle movement generating a sound power level of 85.4 dB(A) per movement (Bayerisches Landesamt für Umwelt

2007). A full movement includes the arrival and departure in the same hour as well as travel through the parking area. The parking garage was modeled as an area source.

**Emergency Generators:** Emergency generators would be located south of Buildings CP3 and CP4. Emergency generators may be used to supply necessary power requirements to vital systems. Emergency generators produce noise levels of approximately 82 dB(A) L<sub>eq</sub> at 50 feet, which is a sound power level of approximately 117 dB(A). Emergency generators are typically operated under two conditions: loss of main electrical supply or preventive maintenance/testing. The emergency generators would be shielded with a block wall screen. Masonry walls would reduce noise levels by at least 40 dB. The operation of mechanical equipment associated with emergency operations is exempt from the noise standards outlined in the Municipal Code; thus, noise generated by emergency generators is not compared to the limits shown in Table 3 of the noise report (see Appendix J). Because the emergency generator would be shielded from adjacent uses and would only be used during emergencies and for routine maintenance/testing, noise would be less than significant.

Noise levels due to on-site sources were modeled using SoundPLAN (Navcon Engineering 2015). Noise levels were also modeled for a series of 16 specific receiver locations along the project site property line. As detailed in Appendix J, maximum hourly noise levels at the property line due to on-site noise sources are projected to be approximately 53 dB(A)  $L_{eq}$  or less. This would be less than the City property line limit of 75 dB(A)  $L_{eq}$ . Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

#### 8.6.2.2 Construction Noise

Noise associated with the demolition, grading, building, and paving for the project would potentially result in short-term impacts to surrounding residential properties. A variety of noise-generating equipment would be used during the construction phase of the project such as scrapers, backhoes, front-end loaders, and concrete saws, along with others. The exact number and pieces of construction equipment required are not known at this time. In the absence of specifics, it was assumed that the loudest noise levels would occur during grading activities. Although maximum noise levels may be 85 to 90 dB(A)  $L_{eq}$  at a distance of 50 feet during most construction activities, hourly average noise levels would be 82 dB(A)  $L_{eq}$  at 50 feet from the center of construction activity when assessing the loudest pieces of equipment working simultaneously.

Section 59.5.0404 of the City's Noise Abatement and Control Ordinance regulates construction noise. As stated in Section 59.5.0404, construction noise shall not exceed 75 dB(A) L<sub>eq</sub> at the nearest residential property. There are no residential uses in the vicinity of the project. The surrounding land uses include industrial, commercial, office, open space, and undeveloped land. The nearest sensitive land use is a hospital located more than 1,500 feet to the south. A worst-case noise level of 82 dB(A) L<sub>eq</sub> at 50 feet would attenuate to 52 dB(A) L<sub>eq</sub> at 1,500 feet. Noise due to construction of the project would not exceed the limits of the City's Noise Abatement and Control Ordinance. Additionally, construction of the proposed project would only occur between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m., Monday through Saturday, and thus would comply with local standards and regulations. Because construction activities associated with the project would comply with the applicable regulation for construction, temporary increases in noise levels from construction activities would be less than significant.

## 8.7 Public Services and Utilities

The 1993 FEIR did not analyze impacts to public services or utilities. The project is non-residential, would not generate additional demand for services through population increases, and is not expected to result in a need for a new or expanded police, fire, school, park, library, or other public facility. In addition, the project would include all necessary improvements to provide utility service to the project and the environmental impacts of such improvements are analyzed in the subsequent paragraphs. The project also includes a Waste Management Plan (WMP) prepared by RECON (January 7, 2016; Appendix K), which would achieve the City's minimum construction waste diversion goal of 75 percent and avoid significant solid waste impacts. Project- and site-specific analysis is provided in the following paragraphs.

### 8.7.1 Public Services

Public services are those functions that serve residents on a communitywide basis. These functions include fire protection and emergency medical services, police protection, public recreational facilities and parks, and libraries.

Each of the buildings proposed for the project would contain scientific research and development space and one to two levels below grade for delivery, storage, utility, and parking. As no housing is proposed, no new population-based park facilities would be required, and the project would not affect local school districts or libraries. The project is consistent with the UCP and impacts would be less than significant. Furthermore, the project would pay applicable impact fees prior to issuance of building permits.

#### 8.7.1.1 Fire Protection and Emergency Medical Services

Fire protection services are provided by the City's Fire-Rescue Department. The project site is within the purview of Fire Station 35 (which serves University City and its surrounding areas) and Fire Station 41 (which serves Sorrento Valley and its surrounding areas). Both stations are approximately 1.25 miles from the project site. A new fire station (#50) has been approved and funded for North University City, but is not operational as of the writing of this document.

Emergency medical services are provided to the project site and throughout the City through a public/private partnership between the City's Emergency Medical Services (EMS) and Rural Metro Corporation, which provides some personnel and ambulances. EMS has ambulances, paramedics, and emergency medical technicians (EMTs) who respond to emergency calls. The Fire-Rescue Department triages 911 calls by sending a first responder to approximately 65 percent of 911 calls when there is a potentially life-threatening condition.

#### 8.7.1.2 Police Services

Police services are provided by the City's Police Department, which offers a variety of resources related to crime prevention and education, including crime statistics and maps, as well as instructions on reporting emergencies and non-emergencies. The Police Department has divided the

neighborhoods of the City into nine divisions. The Northern Division (4275 Eastgate Mall) serves the project site. The project is located in Beat 115.

The Police Department currently uses a five-level priority dispatch system, which includes, in descending order: Priority E (Emergency), One, Two, Three, and Four calls. The calls are prioritized by the phone dispatcher and routed to the radio operator for dispatch to the field units; the radio dispatcher has the discretion to raise or lower the call priority as necessary based on information received. Priority E and Priority One calls involve serious crimes in progress or those with a potential for injury. The response time goals are 7 minutes for Priority E calls, 12 minutes for Priority One calls, 30 minutes for Priority Two calls, and 90 minutes for Priority Three and Four calls.

The Police Department is currently reaching its targeted staffing ratio of 1.34 sworn officers per 1,000 residents. Although the 2014 average response times for Beat 115 did not meet the Police Department's citywide response time goals, there are no current plans for additional police substations in the immediate area.

Overall, the project would not result in a need for new or expanded fire, EMS, or police services or facilities; therefore, the project impact would be less than significant.

## 8.7.2 Public Utilities

#### 8.7.2.1 Water

Water service is already provided to the site by the City's Public Utilities Department (PUD) through an existing main in Center Point Drive. The PUD purchases up to 90 percent of its water from the San Diego County Water Authority (SDCWA), which in turn purchases most of its water from the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (MWD). Both of these entities have completed substantial water supply planning through water management plans to ensure adequate, reliable water supply is available over the next 25 years, even in multiple year drought conditions and in potential water supply disruption situations.

Water supply availability is also evaluated through California Senate Bill (SB) 221 and SB 610, which requires water suppliers to prepare a water supply assessment for large-scale developments. As the project would employ less than 1,000 people, the project is not considered a large-scale project and a water supply assessment is not required.

The project includes the installation of private waterlines on-site which would connect to the existing public water main in Campus Point Drive. No additional infrastructure would be required to provide water service to the project.

The project is seeking LEED Silver certification and, as a part of that, would include water conservation measures. The proposed indoor and outdoor water use reduction features would include the use of drought-tolerant and native vegetation, efficient irrigation systems, and low-flow fixtures. Overall, the project would not result in excessive water use and water impacts would be less than significant.

#### 8.7.2.2 Wastewater

The PUD also provides wastewater service to the site. The City's wastewater collection, treatment, and disposal system is called the Metropolitan Sewerage, and includes Point Loma Wastewater Treatment Facility, ocean outfall pipes, pump stations, interconnecting interceptor sewers, and North City and South Bay Water Reclamation Plants. A sewer study has been prepared for the project by Michael Baker International (November 25, 2015; see Appendix L); the study provides an assessment of the proposed system's ability to convey the project's sewer flow to the trunk sewer located in Campus Point Drive.

Appendix L states that there is a sewer line at the southeast corner of the existing CP1 building which is undersized. The project includes the installation of private sewer lines on-site and replacement of the undersized line. The private lines would discharge into the existing public 12-inch sewer main in Campus Point Drive, and would conform to the City's Sewer Design guide. No additional sewer infrastructure would be required to provide water service to the project. Thus, all sewer infrastructure would conform with the City's Sewer Design Guide and sewer facility impacts of the project would be less than significant.

#### 8.7.2.3 Solid Waste

A WMP was prepared for the project (see Appendix K) in order to identify the solid waste impacts that would be generated by demolition, construction, and operation of the project and measures to reduce those impacts.

The majority of solid waste generated in the City is collected by City-franchised haulers. There are three major disposal facilities within the San Diego region and several material recovery facilities that sort segregated and comingled recyclable materials for shipping to processing centers. The three disposal facilities are the City-operated Miramar Landfill, and the privately-operated Sycamore and Otay landfills. Based on their Solid Waste Facility Permit and the Solid Waste Information System (State of California 2014), and the Five-Year Review Report of the County Integrated Waste Management Plan for the County of San Diego (County of San Diego 2011), the Miramar Landfill is expected to be operational until 2023, the Sycamore Landfill is expected to remain open until 2031, and the Otay landfill closure date is estimated as 2027. Also, the Sycamore landfill is currently proposed to be expanded, which would extend operations to 2042. Given the waste reduction target of 75 percent, the majority of waste must be handled at facilities other than landfills. Currently there is insufficient capacity for organic materials collection, diversion, and processing required by State law under Assembly Bill 1826

In an effort to address landfill capacity and impacts associated with solid waste management, the California Legislature passed the Integrated Waste Management Act in 1989 (Assembly Bill 939), which mandated that all cities reduce waste disposed in landfills from generators within their borders by 50 percent by the year 2000. In 2011, Assembly Bill 341 increased the diversion target to 75 percent.

According to the City's Significance Determination Thresholds (City of San Diego 2011), a project would potentially have a significant direct impact if it proposed over 1,000,000 square feet of

building space (estimated 1,500 tons of waste) or a significant cumulative impact if it includes over 40,000 square feet of building space (estimated 60 tons). The project would exceed both the direct impact and cumulative impact thresholds, and therefore was required to prepare a Waste Management Plan (see Appendix K).

#### a. Grading, Demolition, and Construction Phases

As discussed in Appendix K and shown in Table 8-4, a total of approximately 79,689 tons of material would be generated during the demolition, grading, and construction phases. As estimated in the WMP, 69,363 tons of material would be diverted through salvage, reuse, or recycling. This amounts to about a 99.6 percent reduction in solid waste which would be diverted from the landfill due to recycling asphalt, concrete, metals, clean wood, carpet, cardboard, and vegetation materials at source-separated facilities that achieve a 100 percent diversion rate from landfills. Because the project would exceed the requirements for a minimum of 75 percent diversion, impacts would be less than significant.

Table 8-4 Total Waste Generated, Diverted, and Disposed by Phase						
Phase Tons Generated Tons Diverted Tons Disposed						
Demolition	9,733	9,733 (100%)	0 (0%)			
Grading	68,380	68,380 (100%)	0 (0%)			
Construction 1,576 1,250 (79%) 326 (21%)						
TOTAL         79,689         79,363 (99.6%)         326 (0.4%)						
NOTE: Totals may vary due to independent rounding.						

#### **b.** Occupancy Phase

The project proposes a total of up to 359,883 square feet of non-residential uses. Therefore, the project is required to provide a minimum of 1,440 square feet of total exterior refuse and recyclable material storage area. In addition, the site manager shall implement measures to ensure that the operations phase of the project complies with the City of San Diego Recycling Ordinance.

During occupancy, the WMP includes requirements to provide sufficient interior and exterior storage space for refuse and recyclable materials, and a means of handling and recycling landscaping and green waste materials. The WMP outlines strategies to achieve 99.6 percent of waste being diverted from disposal during the construction, demolition, and grading phases of the proposed project. This would reduce the anticipated impact of waste disposal to below the direct impact threshold of significance as well as greatly exceed the state requirement of 50 percent diversion set forth in Assembly Bill 939 and future Assembly Bill 341 goal of 75 percent diversion. Although the occupancy phase is anticipated to involve a recurring shortcoming of only 40 percent diversion with implementation of an ongoing waste management plan, this would be compensated for by additional LEED-specified waste reduction measures and the near 100 percent diversion rate during the other phases. Overall, by complying with City solid waste ordinances and implementation of the WMP (see Appendix K), impacts would be less than significant.

## 8.8 Agricultural Resources

Agricultural resources were not analyzed in the 1993 FEIR. The project site does not contain Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, or Unique Farmland as designated by the California Department of Conservation, nor is the project site subject to, or near, a Williamson Act contract parcel. Therefore, project development would have no effect on agricultural resources.

## 8.9 Mineral Resources

The 1993 FEIR does not analyze the issue of mineral resources. While portions of the site lie within both the MRZ-1 and MRZ-3 zones (as identified in the General Plan's Generalized Mineral Land Classification map, Figure CE-6), the MRZ-2 zone (indicating a high likelihood for significant mineral deposits) is not present. Further, due to the fact that the project site and surrounding area is already developed or within the MHPA, extraction of any potential mineral resources is not feasible. The project would not result in the loss of availability of valuable known mineral resources of a locally important mineral recovery site as identified in the City General Plan. Thus, the project would have no impact to mineral resources.

## 8.10 Energy Conservation

The 1993 FEIR did not analyze the issue of energy conservation. The project has been designed to achieve LEED Silver, which requires several energy- and insulation-efficiency measures to be included in the design of the structures. LEED-required design measures include fundamental commissioning and verification, minimum energy performance, building-level energy metering, and fundamental refrigerant management. The following design measures are not required, but some would be implemented to enable the project to achieve LEED Silver certification: enhanced commissioning (up to 6 points), optimize energy performance (up to 18 points), advanced energy metering (1 point), demand response (up to 2 points), renewable energy production (up to 3 points), enhanced refrigerant management (1 point), and green power and carbon offsets (up to 2 points). The incorporation of some of these additional energy-conserving measures would further reduce the amount of energy used by the project. In addition to achieving LEED Silver, the project would be conditioned to meet 2013 Title 24, Part 6 Energy Code and Part 11 California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen) requirements.

The proposed project's design guidelines call for the installation of roof-mounted photovoltaic solar panels. These solar panels would offset some of the project's total energy demand. The reduction in energy needed from the grid would be most significant during periods of bright sunlight. When the photovoltaic panels receive little or no sunlight (during cloudy weather and at night), the amount of energy needed from the grid would be greater.

Overall, the project would not result in the excessive use of electric power, fuel, or other forms of energy. Thus, the project impact to energy conservation would be less than significant.
### 8.11 Population and Housing

The 1993 FEIR does not discuss population and housing. The project involves the development of a master plan for additional buildings and accessory uses in order to provide for a scientific and research facility. However, the project is not large enough to induce growth through an increase in employment population. Further, the project would not displace any existing housing or people; therefore, the project impact to population and housing would be less than significant.

# 9

# Chapter 9 Project Alternatives

In order to fully evaluate the environmental effects of projects, the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) mandates that alternatives to the project be analyzed. Section 15126.6 of the CEQA Guidelines requires the discussion of "a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project" and the evaluation of the comparative merits of the alternatives. The alternatives discussion is intended to "focus on alternatives to the project or its location which are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant effects of the project," even if these alternatives would impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives. Because this is an SEIR, a discussion of the alternatives which were analyzed in the 1993 FEIR is included in Section 9.1 below.

As discussed in Chapter 4 of this SEIR, the project could result in significant, direct, and/or cumulative environmental impacts related to land use (Multi-Habitat Planning Area Land Use Adjacency Guidelines [MHPA-LUAG]), transportation/circulation, biological resources (nesting birds/raptors), historical resources (unknown resources), and paleontological resources.

Mitigation measures have been identified that would reduce all direct and cumulative impacts to below a level of significance, with the exception of transportation/circulation impacts. In developing the alternatives to be addressed in this section, consideration was given to their ability to meet the basic objectives of the project and eliminate or substantially reduce significant environmental impacts. As identified in Chapter 3, project objectives include the following:

- Provide the region with additional jobs in the life science and biotech industries.
- Intensify an existing industrial/research uses in a manner that provides a campus-like environment with comprehensive site design and substantial landscaping.
- Enhance the access, orientation, and walkability of the existing site.

- Provide an inviting, high-quality scientific research campus that incorporates sustainable design measures.
- Contribute to regional goals to reduce vehicle use and promote alternative transportation use by providing a facility within a convenient distance of present and future alternative transportation facilities.
- Create a coherent and cohesive building and site design that is compatible in scale and character and enhances the existing community character in the UCP.

The alternatives identified in this section are intended to reduce or avoid significant environmental effects of the project. The EIR addresses a No Project (No Development) Alternative and a Reduced Development Alternative. Each major issue area included in the impact analysis of this EIR has been given consideration in the alternatives analyses, and impacts are summarized in Table 9-1.

As required under Section 15126.6 (e)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines, the EIR must identify the environmentally superior alternative. Pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines, if the No Project Alternative is determined to be the most environmentally superior project, then another alternative among the alternatives evaluated must be identified as the environmentally superior project. Section 9.4 addresses the Environmentally Superior Alternative.

Table 9-1				
Comparison of Project and Alternatives Impacts Summary				
		No Project	Reduced	
		(No Development)	Development	
Environmental Issue Area	Project	Alternative	Alternative	
Land Use				
Plan Consistency (Traffic)	LS	No impact (-)	LS (-)	
Marine Corps Air Station Miramar Airport Land Use	LS	No impact (-)	LS (=)	
Compatibility Plan Compatibility Land Development Code Compliance	LS	No impact (-)	LS (=)	
MSCP/MHPA Consistency (MHPA-LUAG)	SM	No impact (-)	SM (=)	
General Plan Noise/Land Use Compatibility	LS	No impact (-)	LS (=)	
Traffic/Circulation	LJ		L3 (-)	
Traffic Capacity	SNM	No impact (-)	SM (-)	
Traffic Generation	LS	No impact (-)	LS (=)	
Freeways, Interchanges, and Ramps	LS	No impact (-)	LS (-)	
Access and Traffic Hazards	LS	No impact (-)	LS (=)	
Alternative Transportation	LS	No impact (-)	LS (=)	
Biological Resources				
Sensitive Species (Nesting Birds/Raptors)	SM	No impact (-)	SM (=)	
Sensitive Habitats	LS	No impact (-)	LS (=)	
Wetlands	LS	No impact (-)	LS (=)	
Wildlife Movement	LS	No impact (-)	LS (=)	
MSCP	LS	No impact (-)	LS (=)	
MHPA Land Use Adjacency (CAGN – Noise)	SM	No impact (-)	SM (=)	
Local Policies and Ordinances	LS	No impact (-)	LS (=)	
Invasive Species	LS	No impact (-)	LS (=)	
Historical Resources			1	
Prehistoric/Historic Resources	SM	No impact (-)	SM (=)	
(Unknown Subsurface) Religious/Sacred Uses	LS	No impact (-)	LS (=)	
Human Remains	LS	No impact (-)	LS (=)	
Paleontological Resources	LJ	No impact ( )	L3()	
High and Moderate Potential	SM	No impact (-)	SM (=)	
Visual Quality/Neighborhood Character	0		0()	
Public Views	LS	No impact (-)	LS (-)	
Neighborhood Character	LS	No impact (-)	LS (=)	
Light/Glare	LS	No impact (-)	LS (-)	
SNM = significant not mitigated			1	
LS = less than significant				
SM = significant and mitigated				
(-) = less impact than the project				
(=) = same impact as the project				
MSCP = Multiple Species Conservation Program				
MHPA = Multi-Habitat Planning Area				
LUAG = Land Use Adjacency Guidelines				
CAGN = coastal California gnatcatcher				

### 9.1 Alternatives Analyzed in 1993 FEIR

The 1993 FEIR discussed four alternatives, including a no project alternative, two reduced intensity alternatives, and an alternate site alternative. The following is a discussion of why all four of these alternatives are either inapplicable or infeasible under current conditions.

#### 9.1.1 No Project Alternative

The total acreage analyzed in the 1993 FEIR and currently is the same: 58.19 acres gross and 40.28 acres net. The baseline condition studied in the 1993 FEIR included the IVAC building (now "CP1"), but before the subsequent expansions. In addition, the Qualcomm building (CP2) had not been constructed at that time. Thus, the No Project Alternative involved retaining the (then) 379,000-square-foot IVAC facility. The 1993 FEIR states that this alternative would eliminate the direct impacts to traffic and air quality, as well as the cumulative impacts to traffic, land use, noise, air quality, and water quality. However, it would not meet the goals of the project or of the University Community Plan (UCP) of encouraging the development of scientific research use.

This alternative is no longer applicable because the Qualcomm building (CP2) has been constructed since the 1993 FEIR was certified. Thus, the baseline for this SEIR is 731,735 square feet while the baseline in 1993 was 379,000 square feet. However, a No Project Alternative is included below under Section 9.2 which utilizes the current baseline.

#### 9.1.2 Reduced Intensity #1: 18,000 Square Feet per Acre

The 1993 FEIR assumed that this alternative would be built out to an <u>actual</u> intensity of 18,000 square feet per net acre (sf/ac) rather than having to rely upon the TDM to get down to the 18,000 sf/ac equivalent. The 1993 FEIR concludes that this alternative would not have any substantial environmental benefits and this alternative was not considered to be the environmentally superior alternative.

The two existing buildings that form the baseline for the SEIR total 731,725 square feet. Using 40.28 as our net acreage results in a current baseline of 18,166 square feet per acre. Thus, the baseline already exceeds 18,000 sf/ac, making this alternative inapplicable/infeasible because it results in another No Project (No Development) Alternative.

#### 9.1.3 Reduced Intensity #2: 12,000 Square Feet per Acre

The 1993 FEIR assumed that this alternative would be built out to an intensity of 12,000 sf/ac. The 1993 FEIR states that this alternative was intended to help reduced traffic impacts to intersections on Genesee Avenue. The 1993 FEIR goes on to conclude that (as with the 18,000 sf/ac alternative) this alternative would not fully avoid direct and cumulative impacts relative to traffic, noise, land use, air quality, and water quality. This alternative was not considered to be the environmentally superior alternative.

As with the 18,000 sf/ac alternative, this alternative allows an intensity which is less than the existing baseline; thus, this would essentially result in yet another No Project (No Development) Alternative.

#### 9.1.4 Off-site Alternative

The "Meanley" property in Scripps Miramar Ranch was identified in the 1993 FEIR as a potential offsite location for the project. The site was approximately 100 acres and had been subdivided for industrial uses. The site was selected because the property's EIR determined that no significant traffic, noise, air quality, or water quality impacts would occur. Thus, the off-site alternative was determined by the 1993 FEIR to be the environmentally superior alternative because it would avoid the direct and cumulative impacts on the local community associated with traffic, noise, land use air quality, and water quality. However, it would not achieve the objective to promote scientific research uses in the vicinity of the University of California, San Diego.

As with the other three alternatives discussed in the 1993 FEIR, this alternative is not applicable and will not be discussed in greater detail in this SEIR for the reason that in the years since the 1993 FEIR was certified, the Meanly property has been substantially built out.

#### 9.2 No Project (No Development) Alternative

The following discussion of the No Project Alternative is based on the CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(3)(B) which states:

If the project is other than a land use or regulatory plan, for example a development project on identifiable property, the no project alternative is the circumstance under which the project does not proceed. Here the discussion would compare the environmental effects of the property remaining in its existing state against environmental effects which would occur if the project is approved. If disapproval of the project under consideration would result in predictable actions by others, such as the proposal of some other project, this no project consequence should be discussed. In certain instances, the no project alternative means "no build" wherein the existing environmental setting is maintained. However, where failure to proceed with the project will not result in preservation of existing conditions, the analysis should identify the practical result of the project's non-approval and not create and analyze a set of artificial assumptions that would be required to preserve existing physical environment.

Further, according to Section 15126.6(e)(3)(C):

After defining the no project alternative ..., the lead agency should proceed to analyze the impacts of the no project alternative by projecting what would reasonably be expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project were not approved, based on current plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services. Based on this approach, the No Project (No Development) Alternative for the project would be maintaining the site in its current condition and would be equivalent to the existing environmental setting. The site presently contains two existing multi-tenant buildings used for scientific research and development (CP1 & CP2) totaling 731,725 square feet, along with parking and accessory structures.

A comparative analysis of the impacts associated with this alternative and the project is provided below.

#### 9.2.1 Land Use

The No Project (No Development) Alternative would be consistent with the UCP in that it would not generate any additional trips and would eliminate the need for amending the UCP. Maintaining the project site with the existing condition would not conflict with the General Plan, UCP, multiple species conservation program (MSCP), Marine Corps Air station (MCAS) Miramar Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP), or other applicable land use plans. Thus, this alternative would have no land use impact. The boundary line correction (BLC) which would remove 1.09 acres of parking lot from the MHPA while adding 1.86 acres of coastal sage scrub and eucalyptus woodland would not occur under this alternative. It is noted that this alternative would continue the operations of the existing development adjacent to the MHPA, but it would not be required to comply with the MHPA adjacency guidelines since it was constructed prior to the MSCP adoption.

#### 9.2.2 Traffic Circulation

Since this alternative would not result in additional traffic, the significant direct and cumulative traffic impacts of the project would be avoided. This includes the avoidance of the project's significant and unmitigated direct traffic capacity impacts at Interstate 5 and Genesee Avenue and the southbound ramp.

#### 9.2.3 Biological Resources

There would be no construction activities with the No Project (No Development) Alternative and significant impacts associated with project construction impacts to raptors and nesting birds would not occur. As mentioned above under land use, this alternative would not require a BLC or compliance with the MHPA adjacency guidelines. The No Project (No Development) Alternative would avoid the project's significant, mitigated biological impacts (nesting birds) and no new biological resource impacts would occur.

#### 9.2.4 Historical Resources

In the absence of grading for the No Project (No Development) Alternative, there would be no potential to uncover subsurface cultural resources. Any unknown buried resources would remain buried. The project requires mitigation during construction to reduce potential impacts. Therefore, the project's significant, mitigated impacts to historical resources would be avoided under the No Project (No Development) Alternative.

#### 9.2.5 Paleontological Resources

In the absence of grading under the No Project (No Development) Alternative, there would be no potential to impact paleontological resources within any fossil-bearing formation on-site. Any unknown buried resources would remain buried. The project would result in potentially significant paleontological resources and requires mitigation during construction to reduce potential impacts. The significant, mitigated project impacts to paleontological resources would be avoided under the No Project (No Development) Alternative.

#### 9.2.6 Visual Quality/Neighborhood Character

Under the No Project Alternative, the site would remain in its current baseline condition, with two low- to mid-rise buildings totaling 731,725 square feet. The six-story parking structure, 6- and 12- story tiered building, and the amenities building would not be constructed. As discussed in Section 4.6, the visual quality/neighborhood character impacts associated with the project would be considered less than significant given the existing visual context of the Interstate 5 corridor within the vicinity of the project. Therefore, while the visual impacts associated with the project would be less than significant, the No Project Alternative would have no impacts and the impact would be less as compared to the project.

#### 9.2.7 Conclusions

Should the No Project (No Development) Alternative be implemented, all the project's significant impacts would be avoided. More specifically, this alternative would avoid the project's significant mitigated transportation/circulation, biological resource, historical resource, and paleontological resource impacts. Importantly, the significant unmitigated traffic impacts would also be avoided by the No Project (No Development) Alternative. While adoption of the No Project (No Development) Alternative would maintain the existing underdeveloped condition of the site and avoid impacts associated with the project, none of the project objectives would be attained.

## 9.3 Reduced Development Alternative

The Reduced Development Alternative was designed to reduce the traffic trips generated in order to avoid significant and not mitigated traffic generation/UCP conformance impacts. The Reduced Development Alternative would involve construction of up to an additional 140,000 square feet plus an associated parking structure. The 140,000-square-foot building would be constructed at the location of CP3 and would be a 5-story building with 28,000 square feet per floor. The parking structure would be within the same footprint as the proposed project's parking structure, but would be approximately one-third the size. Thus, the primary difference between this alternative and the project would be that this alternative would not develop CP4, and both CP3 and the parking structure would be constructed to approximately one-third the size of what is proposed.

The parking structure would be of a size necessary to maintain a parking ratio of 2.5 spaces per 1,000 square feet, or approximately 350 spaces ([140,000 square feet ÷ 1,000 square feet] x 2.5). As

with the proposed project, the Reduced Development Alternative would stay within the existing disturbed portion of the project site.

A comparative analysis of the impacts associated with the Reduced Development Alternative and the project is provided below.

#### 9.3.1 Land Use

The Reduced Development Alternative would be consistent with the General Plan and the UCP. This alternative would not result in an increase of traffic beyond what was anticipated in the UCP, and the community plan amendment would not be required.

Like the project, the Reduced Development Alternative would be compatible with the MCAS Miramar ALUCP. Indirect impacts to the adjacent MHPA from project construction and operation would be similar to the project because the same infrastructure and circulation improvements would occur along both the private and public portions of Campus Point Drive. Like the project, this alternative would propose a BLC, and would result in a less than significant impact to the MHPA. In addition, like the project, the Reduced Development Alternative would also be required to comply with the MHPA Land Use Adjacency Guidelines (LU-1).

Lastly, like the proposed project, no deviation from the LDC would be required and no significant impacts would result.

#### 9.3.2 Traffic Circulation

As indicated above, the Reduced Development Alternative would generate 1,120 trips, which would be 1,435 fewer trips than the project at full buildout. This reduction in trips would avoid the proposed project's significant (but mitigated) direct and cumulative impact at the Genesee Avenue and La Jolla Village Drive intersection (Impact TR-4) as well as the two significant and not mitigated Interstate 5/Genesee Avenue interchange impacts (Impacts TR-1 and TR-3). However, this alternative would still require implementation of traffic mitigation measures TR-2 and TR-5. Refer to the analysis in Section 4.2.3 for additional information.

As described under Section 9.3.1 above, this alternative would not exceed the trip generation allocated by the UCP and would not require a community plan amendment to remove the requirement to mitigate peak hour trips to the equivalent of 18,000 sf/acre. Under this alternative, the temporarily significant and unmitigable traffic impacts at Genesee and Interstate 5 and the southbound ramps would not occur (TR-1 & TR-3); nor would the impact at Genesee Avenue and La Jolla Village Drive (TR-4) occur. The reduced project alternative would still have the same significant but mitigable impacts to the Campus Point Drive segment (TR-2) and the Campus Point Drive/Campus Point Court intersection (TR-5).

As described for the project under Section 4.2, the Reduced Development Alternative would have less than significant impacts related to freeways, traffic hazards, and alternative transportation.

#### 9.3.3 Biological Resources

Since the Reduced Development Alternative would have the same development footprint as the project, the impacts associated with this alternative would be similar to the project. Accordingly, indirect impacts to raptors and migratory birds would need to be mitigated to below a level of significance by mitigation measures BIO-1 and BIO-2 to ensure that construction-related activities would not disrupt the breeding and/or nesting of these birds.

#### 9.3.4 Historical Resources

Construction of the Reduced Development Alternative would result in incrementally less impacts as the project, though grading would still be required in areas where there is a potential for subsurface resources to be encountered. Therefore, like the project, the Reduced Development Alternative would require monitoring during construction (mitigation measure HIST-1), in order to reduce the impact to below a level of significance should resources be encountered.

#### 9.3.5 Paleontological Resources

The project has the potential to impact paleontological resources which may occur on the project site due to proposed grading cuts into geologic formation with moderate to high potential to yield significant fossils. This alternative would have a similar potential to impact paleontological resources, as this alternative would also involve grading within the same sensitive formations, though to a lesser degree. Development under this alternative would be required to implement the same paleontological mitigation measure (PALEO-1) as the project, which would similarly reduce the impact to below a level of significance.

#### 9.2.6 Visual Quality/Neighborhood Character

Under the Reduced Development Alternative, a 5-story 140,000-square-foot building would be constructed within the approximate footprint of CP3 and a 350-space parking structure would be constructed within the same footprint as the proposed parking structure. As discussed in Section 4.6, the visual quality/neighborhood character impacts associated with the project would be considered less than significant given the existing visual context of the I-5 corridor within the vicinity of the project. Given that the height of the CP3 building would be reduced from 6/12 stories (tiered) to 5 stories, the visual impact of this alternative would be both less than significant and incrementally reduced as compared to the project.

#### 9.3.7 Conclusions

The Reduced Development Alternative would avoid the two significant and unmitigated traffic impacts and one of the significant but mitigated traffic impacts of the project. This alternative would also avoid the project's significant impacts related to traffic generation in excess of the UCP and would not require a community plan amendment. All other impacts under the Reduced Development Alternative would be similar to the project although incrementally reduced, as the

total square footage of proposed buildings would be smaller. Thus, this alternative would have significant but mitigated impacts related to land use, biological resources, historical resources, and paleontological resources, similar to the project. This alternative would meet the basic project objectives, although to a lesser degree than the project since it would provide less infill development.

## 9.4 Environmentally Superior Alternative

CEQA Guidelines (Section 15126.6(e)(2)) require that an environmentally superior alternative be identified among the alternatives considered. The environmentally superior alternative is generally defined as the alternative which would result in the least adverse environmental impacts to the project site and surrounding area. If the No Project Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative, then the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative from the other alternatives.

As discussed in Section 9.1 above, none of the four alternatives previously analyzed in the 1993 FEIR were applicable or feasible and were not discussed in further detail. Therefore, the Reduced Development Alternative, as discussed in Section 9.3, would be considered the environmentally superior alternative since it would avoid several project impacts associated with traffic, including significant, temporarily unmitigated direct capacity impacts. Other impacts would be incrementally reduced or the same as the project. The Reduced Development Alternative would meet all of the project's objectives, though to a lesser degree than the project.

# 10

# Chapter 10 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Section 21081.6 requires that a mitigation monitoring and reporting program (MMRP) be adopted upon certification of an EIR to ensure that the mitigation measures are implemented. The mitigation monitoring and reporting program specifies what the mitigation is, the entity responsible for monitoring the program, and when in the process it should be accomplished.

After analysis, potentially significant impacts requiring mitigation were identified for land use, transportation/circulation, biological resources, historical resources, and paleontological resources. There is no feasible mitigation for two of the traffic impacts (TR-1 and TR-3); therefore, no measures are listed in the MMRP for them, and impacts are significant and unavoidable.

The following is an overview of the mitigation monitoring and reporting program to be completed for the project.

#### **Monitoring Activities**

Monitoring activities would be accomplished by individuals identified in the MMRP table. While specific qualifications should be determined by the City, the monitoring team should possess the following capabilities:

- Interpersonal, decision-making, and management skills with demonstrated experience in working under trying field circumstances;
- Knowledge of and appreciation for the general environmental attributes and special features found in the project area;
- Knowledge of the types of environmental impacts associated with construction of costeffective mitigation options; and
- Excellent communication skills.

#### **Program Procedures**

Prior to any construction activities, a preconstruction meeting is required and will include all parties involved in the monitoring program to establish the responsibility and authority of the participants. Mitigation measures that need to be defined in greater detail will be addressed prior to any project plan approvals in follow-up meetings designed to discuss specific monitoring effects.

An effective reporting system must be established prior to any monitoring efforts. All parties involved must have a clear understanding of the mitigation measures as adopted and these mitigations must be distributed to the participants of the monitoring effort. Those that would have a complete list of all the mitigation measures adopted by the City would include the City of San Diego's Mitigation Monitoring Coordination (MMC) office. MMC would distribute to each environmental specialist and environmental monitor a specific list of mitigation measures that pertain to his or her monitoring tasks and the appropriate time frame that these mitigations are anticipated to be implemented.

#### **General Requirements**

The following general requirements would be a part of the proposed project MMRP:

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

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

- In addition, the Environmental Designee shall verify that <u>the MMRP Conditions/Notes</u> <u>that apply ONLY to the construction phases of this project are included VERBATIM</u>, under the heading, "ENVIRONMENTAL/MITIGATION REQUIREMENTS."
- 3. These notes must be shown within the first three (3) sheets of the construction documents in the format specified for engineering construction document templates as shown on the City website: http://www.sandiego.gov/development-services/industry/standtemp.shtml
- 4. The **TITLE INDEX SHEET** must also show on which pages the "Environmental/Mitigation Requirements" notes are provided.
- 5. **SURETY AND COST RECOVERY –** The Development Services Director or City Manager may require appropriate surety instruments or bonds from private Permit Holders to ensure the long term performance or implementation of required mitigation measures or programs. The City is authorized to recover its cost to offset the salary, overhead, and expenses for City personnel and programs to monitor qualifying projects.

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

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

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

CONTACT INFORMATION:

- a) The PRIMARY POINT OF CONTACT is the **RE** at the **Field Engineering Division** 858-627-3200
- b) For Clarification of ENVIRONMENTAL REQUIREMENTS, it is also required to call **RE** and MMC at 858-627-3360
- 2. **MMRP COMPLIANCE:** This Project, Project Tracking System (PTS) #336364, shall conform to the mitigation requirements contained in the associated Environmental Document and implemented to the satisfaction of the DSD's Environmental Designee (MMC) and the City Engineer (RE). The requirements may not be reduced or changed but may be annotated (i.e., to explain when and how compliance is being met and location of verifying proof, etc.). Additional clarifying information may also be added

to other relevant plan sheets and/or specifications as appropriate (i.e., specific locations, times of monitoring, methodology, etc.

- Note: Permit Holder's Representatives must alert RE and MMC if there are any discrepancies in the plans or notes, or any changes due to field conditions. All conflicts must be approved by RE and MMC BEFORE the work is performed.
- 3. **OTHER AGENCY REQUIREMENTS:** Evidence of compliance with all other agency requirements or permits shall be submitted to the RE and MMC for review and acceptance prior to the beginning of work or within one week of the Permit Holder obtaining documentation of those permits or requirements. Evidence shall include copies of permits, letters of resolution, or other documentation issued by the responsible agency.
- 4. **MONITORING EXHIBITS:** All consultants are required to submit, to RE and MMC, a monitoring exhibit on a 11x17-inch reduction of the appropriate construction plan, such as site plan, grading, landscape, etc., marked to clearly show the specific areas including the **LIMIT OF WORK**, scope of that discipline's work, and notes indicating when in the construction schedule that work will be performed. When necessary for clarification, a detailed methodology of how the work will be performed shall be included.
  - Note: Surety and Cost Recovery When deemed necessary by the Development Services Director or City Manager, additional surety instruments or bonds from the private Permit Holder may be required to ensure the long-term performance or implementation of required mitigation measures or programs. The City is authorized to recover its cost to offset the salary, overhead, and expenses for City personnel and programs to monitor qualifying projects.
- 5. **OTHER SUBMITTALS AND INSPECTIONS:** The Permit Holder/Owner's representative shall submit all required documentation, verification letters, and requests for all associated inspections to the RE and MMC for approval per the following schedule:

DOCUMENT SUBMITTAL/INSPECTION CHECKLIST			
Issue Area	Document Submittal	Associated Inspection/Approvals/Notes	
General	Consultant Qualification Letters	Prior to Preconstruction Meeting	
General	Consultant Construction Monitoring Exhibits	Prior to or at Preconstruction Meeting	
Land Use	Land Use Adjacency Issues	Land Use Adjacency Issue Site Observations	
Traffic	Verification of Traffic Mitigation	Prior to Issuance of Grading or Building Permits for Each Phase	
Biology	Biologist Limit of Work Verification	Limit of Work Inspection	
Biology	Biology Monitoring Reports	Biology/Habitat Inspection	
Archaeology	Archaeology Reports	Archaeology/Historic Site Observation	
Paleontology	Paleontology Reports	Paleontology Site Observation	
Waste Management	Waste Management Reports	Waste Management Inspections	
Bond Release	Request for Bond Release Letter	Final MMRP Inspections Prior to Bond Release Letter	

#### Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Table 10-1 summarizes the potentially significant project impacts and lists the associated mitigation measures and the monitoring efforts necessary to ensure that the measures are properly implemented. All the mitigation measures identified in the SEIR are stated herein.

Land Use       MHPA Land Use Adjacency       Frior to issuance of any construction permit or notice to proceed, DSD / LDR, and/or MSCP staff shall verify the Applicant has accurately represented the project's design in or on the Construction Documents (CDs/CDs consist of Construction Plan Sets for Private Projects and Contract Specifications for Public Projects) are in conformance with the associated discretionary permit conditions and Exhibit "A", and also the City's Multi-Specificationary permit conditions and Exhibit "A", and also the City's Multi-Specificationary permit conditions and Exhibit "A", and also the City's Multi-Specificationary permit conditions and Exhibit "A", and also the City's Multi-Species Conservation Program (MSCP) Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA) Land Use Adjacency Guidelines. The applicant shall provide an implementing plan and include references on/in CDs of the following:       Prior to species Conservation Program (MSCP) Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA) Land Use Adjacency Guidelines. The applicant shall provide an implementing plan and include references on/in CDs of the following:         A.       Grading/Land Development/MHPA Boundaries - MHPA boundaries on-site and adjacent properties shall be delineated on the CDs. DSD Planning and/or MSCP staff shall ensure that all grading is included within the development footprint, specifically manufactured slopes, disturbance, and development to the MHPA, all manufactured slopes associated with site development shall be included within the development footprint.         B.       Drainage - All new and proposed parking lots and developed areas in and adjacent to the MHPA, all developed and paved areas must prevent the release of toxins, chemicals, petroleum products, exotic plant materials prior to release by incorporating the use of filtration devices, planted swales and/or planted detention/desiltation basins		Table 10-1 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program		
<ul> <li>MHPA Land Use Adjacency</li> <li>Grading and construction activities have the potential indirectly impact sensitive biological resources within the MHPA. The project would include a BLC to remove the previously developed portions of the project area site that were mapped as part of the MHPA at the regional scale. No MHPA occurs within the impact area where the BLC is applied.</li> <li><b>LU-1:</b> Prior to issuance of any construction permit or notice to proceed, DS/LDR, and/or MSCP staff shall verify the Applicant has accurately represented the project's design in or on the Construction Documents (CDs/CDs consist of Construction Plan Sets for Private Projects and Contract Specifications for Public Projects) are in conformance with the associated discretionary permit conditions and Exhibit "A", and also the City's Multi- Species Conservation Program (MSCP) Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA) Land Use Adjacency Guidelines. The applicant shall provide an implementing plan and include references on/in CDs of the following:</li> <li><b>A. Grading/Land Development/MHPA Boundaries</b> - MHPA boundaries on-site and adjacent properties shall be delineated on the CDs. DSD Planning and/or MSCP staff shall ensure that all grading is included within the development footprint, specifically manufactured slopes, disturbance, and development within or adjacent to the MHPA. For projects within or adjacent to the MHPA, all manufactured slopes associated with site development shall be included within the development footprint.</li> <li><b>Drainage</b> - All new and proposed parking lots and developed areas in and adjacent to the MHPA shall be designed so they do not drain directly into the MHPA. All developed and paved areas must prevent the release of toxins, chemicals, petroleum products, exotic plant materials prior to release by incorporating the use of filtration devices, planted swales and/or planted detention/desiltation basins, or other approved permanent methods that are designed to minimize negative impacts</li></ul>			Timeframe of Mitigation	Monitoring, Enforcement, and Reporting Responsibility
such as excessive water and toxins into the ecosystems of the MHPA.         C.       Toxics/Project Staging Areas/Equipment Storage - Projects that use chemicals or generate by-products such as pesticides, herbicides, and	MHPA Land Use Adjacency Grading and construction activities have the potential indirectly impact ensitive biological resources within the MHPA. The project would include a BLC to remove the previously developed fortions of the project area site that were mapped as part of the MHPA at the regional scale. No MHPA occurs within the impact area where the BLC is	<ul> <li>DSD/ LDR, and/or MSCP staff shall verify the Applicant has accurately represented the project's design in or on the Construction Documents (CDs/CDs consist of Construction Plan Sets for Private Projects and Contract Specifications for Public Projects) are in conformance with the associated discretionary permit conditions and Exhibit "A", and also the City's Multi-Species Conservation Program (MSCP) Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA) Land Use Adjacency Guidelines. The applicant shall provide an implementing plan and include references on/in CDs of the following:</li> <li>A. Grading/Land Development/MHPA Boundaries - MHPA boundaries on-site and adjacent properties shall be delineated on the CDs. DSD Planning and/or MSCP staff shall ensure that all grading is included within the development footprint, specifically manufactured slopes, disturbance, and development within or adjacent to the MHPA. For projects within or adjacent to the MHPA, all manufactured slopes associated with site development shall be included within the development footprint.</li> <li>B. Drainage - All new and proposed parking lots and developed areas in and adjacent to the MHPA shall be designed so they do not drain directly into the MHPA. All developed and paved areas must prevent the release of toxins, chemicals, petroleum products, exotic plant materials prior to release by incorporating the use of filtration devices, planted swales and/or planted detention/desiltation basins, or other approved permanent methods that are designed to minimize negative impacts, such as excessive water and toxins into the ecosystems of the MHPA.</li> <li>C. Toxics/Project Staging Areas/Equipment Storage - Projects that use</li> </ul>	Prior to the issuance of grading permit	City of San Diego

	Table 10-1		
	Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program		
Potential Significant Impact	Mitigation Measures	Timeframe of Mitigation	Monitoring, Enforcement, and Reporting Responsibility
D. E.	animal waste, and other substances that are potentially toxic or impactive to native habitats/flora/fauna (including water) shall incorporate measures to reduce impacts caused by the application and/or drainage of such materials into the MHPA. No trash, oil, parking, or other construction/development-related material/activities shall be allowed outside any approved construction limits. Where applicable, this requirement shall incorporated into leases on publicly-owned property when applications for renewal occur. Provide a note in/on the CDs that states: <i>"All construction related activity that may have potential for leakage or intrusion shall be monitored by the Qualified Biologist/Owners Representative or Resident Engineer to ensure there is no impact to the MHPA."</i>		

	Table 10-1		
	Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program		
Potential Significant Impact	Mitigation Measures	Timeframe of Mitigation	Monitoring, Enforcement, and Reporting Responsibility
	<ul> <li>responsibility of an HOA or other private entity except where narrow wildlife corridors require it to be located outside of the MHPA. Brush management zones will not be greater in size than currently required by the City's regulations, the amount of woody vegetation clearing shall not exceed 50 percent of the vegetation existing when the initial clearing is done and vegetation clearing shall be prohibited within native coastal sage scrub and chaparral habitats from March 1-August 15 except where the City ADD/MMC has documented the thinning would be consist with the City's MSCP Subarea Plan. Existing and approved projects are subject to current requirements of Municipal Code Section 142.0412.</li> <li>H. Noise - Due to the site's location adjacent to or within the MHPA where the Qualified Biologist has identified potential nesting habitat for listed avian species, construction noise that exceeds the maximum levels allowed shall be avoided during the breeding seasons for the following: California Gnatcatcher (3/1-8/15). If construction is proposed during the breeding season for the species, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service protocol surveys shall be required in order to determine species presence/absence. If protocol surveys are not conducted in suitable habitat during the breeding season for the aforementioned listed species, presence shall be assumed with implementation of noise attenuation and biological monitoring.</li> <li>When applicable (i.e., habitat is occupied or if presence of the covered species is assumed), adequate noise reduction measures shall be incorporated as follows:</li> <li>COASTAL CALIFORNIA GNATCATCHER (Federally Threatened)</li> <li>Prior to the issuance of any grading permit, the City Manager (or appointed designee) shall verify that the MHPA boundaries and the following project requirements regarding the coastal California gnatcatcher are shown on the construction plans:</li> </ul>		

	Table 10-1		
	Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program		
Potential Significant Impact		Timeframe of Mitigation	Monitoring, Enforcement, and Reporting Responsibility
	<ul> <li>Mitigation Measures</li> <li>No clearing, grubbing, grading, or other construction activities shall occur between March 1 and August 15, the breeding season of the coastal California gnatcatcher, until the following requirements have been met to the satisfaction of the City Manager:</li> <li>A. A qualified biologist (possessing a valid Endangered Species Act Section 10(a)(1)(a) Recovery Permit) shall survey those habitat areas within the MHPA that would be subject to construction noise levels exceeding 60 decibels [dB(A)] hourly average for the presence of the coastal california gnatcatcher. Surveys for the coastal California gnatcatcher shall be conducted pursuant to the protocol survey guidelines established by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service within the breeding season prior to the commencement of any construction. If gnatcatchers are present, then the following conditions must be met:         <ul> <li>Between March 1 and August 15, no clearing, grubbing, or grading of occupied gnatcatcher habitat shall be permitted. Areas restricted from such activities shall be staked or fenced under the supervision of a qualified biologist; and</li> <li>Between March 1 and August 15, no construction activities shall occur within any portion of the site where construction activities would result in noise levels exceeding 60 dB(A) hourly average at the edge of occupied gnatcatcher habitat. An analysis showing that noise generated by construction activities would not exceed 60 dB(A) hourly average at the edge of occupied habitat must be completed by a qualified acoustician (possessing current noise engineer license or registration with monitoring noise level experience with listed animal species) and approved by the City Manager at least two weeks prior to the commencement of construction activities. Prior to the</li> </ul></li></ul>		Responsibility.

	Table 10-1		
	Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program		
Potential Significant Impact	Mitigation Measures	Timeframe of Mitigation	Monitoring, Enforcement, and Reporting Responsibility
	<ul> <li>season, areas restricted from such activities shall be staked or fenced under the supervision of a qualified biologist; or</li> <li>iii. At least two weeks prior to the commencement of construction activities, under the direction of a qualified acoustician, noise attenuation measures (e.g., berms, walls) shall be implemented to ensure that noise levels resulting from construction activities will not exceed 60 dB(A) hourly average at the edge of habitat occupied by the coastal California gnatcatcher. Concurrent with the commencement of construction activities and the construction of necessary noise attenuation facilities, noise monitoring* shall be conducted at the edge of the occupied habitat area to ensure that noise levels do not exceed 60 dB(A) hourly average. If the noise attenuation techniques implemented are determined to be inadequate by the qualified acoustician or biologist, then the associated construction activities shall cease until such time that adequate noise attenuation is achieved or until the end of the breeding season (August 16).</li> <li>*Construction noise monitoring shall continue to be monitored at least twice weekly on varying days, or more frequently depending on the construction activity, to verify that noise levels at the edge of occupied habitat are maintained below 60 dB(A) hourly average. If not, other measures shall be implemented in consultation with the biologist and the City Manager, as necessary, to reduce noise levels to below 60 dB(A) hourly average or to the ambient noise level if it already exceeds 60 dB(A) hourly average. Such measures may include, but are not limited to, limitations on the placement of construction equipment and the simultaneous use of equipment.</li> </ul>		

	Table 10-1 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program		
Potential Significant Impact	Mitigation Measures	Timeframe of Mitigation	Monitoring, Enforcement, and Reporting Responsibility
	<ul> <li>B. If coastal California gnatcatchers are not detected during the protocol survey, the qualified biologist shall submit substantial evidence to the City Manager and applicable resource agencies which demonstrates whether or not mitigation measures such as noise walls are necessary between March 1 and August 15 as follows: <ol> <li>If this evidence indicates the potential is high for coastal California gnatcatcher to be present based on historical records or site conditions, then condition A.iii shall be adhered to as specified above.</li> <li>If this evidence concludes that no impacts to this species are anticipated, no mitigation measures would be necessary.</li> </ol> </li> </ul>		
Transportation/Circulation			
Impact <b>TR-2</b> (cumulative): Campus Point Drive, north of Genesee Avenue	<b>TR-2:</b> The applicant shall provide a 19.41 percent fair-share towards the removal of parking on the east side of Campus Point Drive and restriping to include an additional northbound lane.	Prior to the issuance of occupancy permits.	City of San Diego
Impact <b>TR-5</b> (direct and cumulative): Campus Point Drive/Campus Point Court	<b>TR-5:</b> Prior to the issuance of the first building permit for the applicant shall assure by permit and bond the signalization of the Campus Point Drive/Campus Point Court intersection, to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. Installation of the signal and associated improvements shall be completed and accepted by the City Engineer prior to issuance of the first occupancy permit.	Prior to the issuance of occupancy permits.	City of San Diego

	Table 10-1 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program		
Potential Significant Impact Biological Resources	Mitigation Measures	Timeframe of Mitigation	Monitoring, Enforcement, and Reporting Responsibility
Biological Resources         Wildlife Species         There is potential for nesting raptors, and other nesting birds within the project area. Proposed grading and construction activities have the potential to result in significant impacts to nesting raptors and migratory birds.	<ul> <li>Nesting Birds/Raptors</li> <li><b>BIO-1:</b> Due to the moderate to high potential of Cooper 's hawk occurrences, in the event construction occurs in or near the MHPA within the breeding season (February 1 to September 15), an avoidance area of 300 feet from any Cooper's hawk nest that occurs within the MHPA shall be required. Additionally, BIO-2 shall be implemented.</li> <li>Biological Resource Protection During Construction</li> <li><b>BIO-2:</b></li> <li><b>1.</b> Prior to Construction <ul> <li>A. Biologist Verification -The owner/permittee shall provide a letter to the City's Mitigation Monitoring Coordination (MMC) section stating that a Project Biological Guidelines (2012), has been retained to implement the project's biological monitoring program. The letter shall include the names and contact information of all persons involved in the biological monitoring of the project.</li> <li>B. Preconstruction Meeting - The Qualified Biologist shall attend the preconstruction meeting, discuss the project's biological monitoring program, and arrange to perform any follow up mitigation measures and reporting including site-specific monitoring, restoration or revegetation, and additional fauna/flora surveys/salvage.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Prior to the issuance of a Notice to Proceed	City of San Diego

	Table 10-1 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program		
Potential Significant Impact	Mitigation Measures	Timeframe of Mitigation	Monitoring, Enforcement, and Reporting Responsibility
	<ul> <li>C. Biological Documents - The Qualified Biologist shall submit all required documentation to MMC verifying that any special mitigation reports including but not limited to, maps, plans, surveys, survey timelines, or buffers are completed or scheduled per City Biology Guidelines, Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP), Environmentally Sensitive Lands Ordinance (ESL), project permit conditions; California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA); endangered species acts (ESAs); and/or other local, state or federal requirements.</li> <li>D. BCME - The Qualified Biologist shall present a Biological</li> </ul>		
	Construction Mitigation/Monitoring Exhibit (BCME) which includes the biological documents in C above. In addition, include: restoration/revegetation plans, plant salvage/relocation requirements (e.g., coastal cactus wren plant salvage, burrowing owl exclusions, etc.), avian or other wildlife surveys/survey schedules (including general avian nesting and USFWS protocol), timing of surveys, wetland buffers, avian construction avoidance areas/noise buffers/ barriers, other impact avoidance areas, and any subsequent requirements determined by the Qualified Biologist and the City ADD/MMC. The BCME shall include a site plan, written and graphic depiction of the project's biological mitigation/monitoring program, and a schedule. The BCME shall be approved by MMC and referenced in the construction documents.		

	Table 10-1		
	Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program		
Potential Significant Impact	Mitigation Measures	Timeframe of Mitigation	Monitoring, Enforcement, and Reporting Responsibility
	E. Avian Protection Requirements - To avoid any direct impacts to raptors and/or candidate, sensitive, or special status species in the MSCP, removal of habitat that supports active nests in the proposed area of disturbance should occur outside of the breeding season for these species (February 1 to September 15). If removal of habitat in the proposed area of disturbance must occur during the breeding season, the Qualified Biologist shall conduct a pre-construction survey to determine the presence or absence of nesting birds on the proposed area of disturbance. The pre-construction survey shall be conducted within 10 calendar days prior to the start of construction activities (including removal of vegetation). The applicant shall submit the results of the pre-construction survey to City DSD for review and approval prior to initiating any construction plan in conformance with the City's Biology Guidelines and applicable State and Federal Law (i.e. appropriate follow up surveys, monitoring schedules, construction and noise barriers/buffers, etc.) shall be prepared and include proposed measures to be implemented to ensure that take of birds or eggs or disturbance of breeding activities is avoided. The report or mitigation plan shall be submitted to the City for review and approval and implemented to the satisfaction of the City. The City's MMC Section and Biologist shall verify and approve that all measures identified in the report or mitigation plan are in place prior to and/or during construction.		

Table 10-1 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program			
Potential Significant Impact	Mitigation Measures	Timeframe of Mitigation	Monitoring, Enforcement, and Reporting Responsibility
	<ul> <li>F. Resource Delineation - Prior to construction activities, the Qualified Biologist shall supervise the placement of orange construction fencing or equivalent along the limits of disturbance adjacent to sensitive biological habitats and verify compliance with any other project conditions as shown on the BCME. This phase shall include flagging plant specimens and delimiting buffers to protect sensitive biological resources (e.g., habitats/flora &amp; fauna species, including nesting birds) during construction. Appropriate steps/care should be taken to minimize attraction of nest predators to the site.</li> <li>G. Education - Prior to commencement of construction activities, the Qualified Biologist shall meet with the owner/permittee or designee and the construction crew and conduct an on-site educational session regarding the need to avoid impacts outside of the approved construction area and to protect sensitive flora and fauna (e.g., explain the avian and wetland buffers, flag system for removal of invasive species or retention of sensitive plants, and clarify acceptable access routes/methods and staging areas, etc.).</li> </ul>		

		Table 10-1		
Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program				
Potential Significant Impact		Mitigation Measures	Timeframe of Mitigation	Monitoring, Enforcement, and Reporting Responsibility
	II. Durin	g Construction		
	A.	<b>Monitoring</b> - All construction (including access/staging areas) shall be restricted to areas previously identified, proposed for development/staging, or previously disturbed as shown on "Exhibit A" and/or the BCME. The Qualified Biologist shall monitor construction activities as needed to ensure that construction activities do not encroach into biologically sensitive areas, or cause other similar damage, and that the work plan has been amended to accommodate any sensitive species located during the pre-construction surveys. In addition, the Qualified Biologist shall document field activity via the Consultant Site Visit Record (CSVR). The CSVR shall be e-mailed to MMC on the 1 <sup>st</sup> day of monitoring, the 1 <sup>st</sup> week of each month, the last day of monitoring, and immediately in the case of any undocumented condition or discovery.		
	III. Post ( A. In the impacts sh and MSCP Qualified I	Subsequent Resource Identification - The Qualified Biologist shall note/act to prevent any new disturbances to habitat, flora, and/or fauna onsite (e.g., flag plant specimens for avoidance during access, etc.). If active nests or other previously unknown sensitive resources are detected, all project activities that directly impact the resource shall be delayed until species specific local, state or federal regulations have been determined and applied by the Qualified Biologist. Construction Measures event that impacts exceed previously allowed amounts, additional nall be mitigated in accordance with City Biology Guidelines, ESL State CEQA, and other applicable local, state and federal law. The Biologist shall submit a final BCME/report to the satisfaction of the MMC within 30 days of construction completion.		

Table 10-1 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program				
Potential Significant Impact	Mitigation Measures	Timeframe of Mitigation	Monitoring, Enforcement, and Reporting Responsibility	
Historical Resources				
Unknown Archaeological Resources	HIST-1:	Prior to the issuance of	City of San Diego	
Since there is the possibility of subsurface prehistoric or historic deposits to be present that could be uncovered during construction activities, a potentially significant impact could result from the development of the project.	<ol> <li>Prior to Permit Issuance</li> <li>A. Entitlements Plan Check</li> <li>Prior to issuance of any construction permits, including but not limited to, the first Grading Permit, Demolition Plans/Permits and Building Plans/Permits or a Notice to Proceed for Subdivisions, but prior to the first preconstruction meeting, whichever is applicable, the Assistant Deputy Director (ADD) Environmental designee shall verify that the requirements for Archaeological Monitoring and Native American monitoring have been noted on the applicable construction documents through the plan check process.</li> <li>Letters of Qualification have been submitted to ADD</li> <li>The applicant shall submit a letter of verification to MMC identifying the Principal Investigator (PI) for the project and the names of all persons involved in the archaeological monitoring program, as defined in the City of San Diego Historical Resources Guidelines (HRG). If applicable, individuals involved in the archaeological monitoring program must have completed the 40- hour HAZWOPER training with certification documentation.</li> <li>MMC will provide a letter to the applicant confirming the qualifications of the PI and all persons involved in the archaeological monitoring of the project meet the qualifications established in the HRG.</li> <li>Prior to the start of work, the applicant must obtain written approval from MMC for any personnel changes associated with the monitoring program.</li> </ol>	any permit		

Table 10-1 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program			
	II. Prior to Start of Construction		
	A. Verification of Records Search		
	<ol> <li>The PI shall provide verification to MMC that a site specific records search (¼-mile radius) has been completed. Verification includes, but is not limited to a copy of a confirmation letter from South Coastal Information Center, or, if the search was in- house, a letter of verification from the PI stating that the search was completed.</li> </ol>		
	<ol> <li>The letter shall introduce any pertinent information concerning expectations and probabilities of discovery during trenching and/or grading activities.</li> </ol>		
	<ol> <li>The PI may submit a detailed letter to MMC requesting a reduction to the ¼-mile radius.</li> </ol>		
	B. PI Shall Attend Precon Meetings		
	<ol> <li>Prior to beginning any work that requires monitoring; the Applicant shall arrange a Precon Meeting that shall include the PI, Native American consultant/monitor (where Native American resources may be impacted), Construction Manager (CM) and/or Grading Contractor, RE, Building Inspector (BI), if appropriate, and MMC. The qualified Archaeologist and Native American Monitor shall attend any grading/excavation related Precon Meetings to make comments and/or suggestions concerning the Archaeological Monitoring program with the Construction Manager and/or Grading Contractor.</li> </ol>		
	<ul> <li>a. If the PI is unable to attend the Precon Meeting, the Applicant shall schedule a focused Precon Meeting with MMC, the PI, RE, CM or BI, if appropriate, prior to the start of any work that requires monitoring.</li> </ul>		

	Table 10-1	
	Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program	
Potential Significant Impact	Mitigation Measures Timeframe of	Monitoring, Enforcement, and Reporting f Mitigation Responsibility
	III. During Construction	
	A. Monitor(s) Shall be Present During Grading/ Excavation/ Trenching	
	<ol> <li>The Archaeological Monitor shall be present full-time during all soil disturbing and grading/excavation/ trenching activities which could result in impacts to archaeological resources as identified on the AME. The CM is responsible for notifying the RE, PI, and MMC of changes to any construction activities such as in the case of a potential safety concern within the area being monitored. In certain circumstances Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) safety requirements may necessitate modification of the AME.</li> </ol>	
	<ol> <li>The Native American consultant/monitor shall determine the extent of their presence during soil disturbing and grading/excavation/trenching activities based on the AME and provide that information to the PI and MMC. If prehistoric resources are encountered during the Native American consultant/monitor's absence, work shall stop and the Discovery Notification Process detailed in Section III.B–C and IV.A–D shall commence.</li> </ol>	
	3. The PI may submit a detailed letter to MMC during construction requesting a modification to the monitoring program when a field condition such as modern disturbance post-dating the previous grading/trenching activities, presence of fossil formations, or when native soils are encountered that may reduce or increase the potential for resources to be present.	

	Table 10-1 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program			
Potential Significant Impact	Mitigation Measures	Timeframe of Mitigation	Monitoring, Enforcement, and Reporting Responsibility	
	<ol> <li>The archaeological and Native American consultant/monitor shall document field activity via the Consultant Site Visit Record (CSVR). The CSVRs shall be faxed by the CM to the RE the first day of monitoring, the last day of monitoring, monthly (Notification of Monitoring Completion), and in the case of ANY discoveries. The RE shall forward copies to MMC.</li> </ol>			
	B. Discovery Notification Process			
	<ol> <li>In the event of a discovery, the Archaeological Monitor shall direct the contractor to temporarily divert all soil disturbing activities, including but not limited to digging, trenching, excavating or grading activities in the area of discovery and in the area reasonably suspected to overlay adjacent resources and immediately notify the RE or BI, as appropriate.</li> </ol>			
	<ol> <li>The Monitor shall immediately notify the PI (unless Monitor is the PI) of the discovery.</li> </ol>			
	3. The PI shall immediately notify MMC by phone of the discovery, and shall also submit written documentation to MMC within 24 hours by fax or email with photos of the resource in context, if possible.			
	<ol> <li>No soil shall be exported off-site until a determination can be made regarding the significance of the resource specifically if Native American resources are encountered.</li> </ol>			

Table 10-1			
Potential Significant Impact	Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program Mitigation Measures	Timeframe of Mitigation	Monitoring, Enforcement, an Reporting Responsibility
	C. Determination of Significance		
	<ol> <li>The PI and Native American consultant/monitor, where Native American resources are discovered shall evaluate the significance of the resource. If Human Remains are involved, follow protocol in Section IV below.</li> </ol>		
	<ul> <li>a. The PI shall immediately notify MMC by phone to discuss significance determination and shall also submit a letter to MMC indicating whether additional mitigation is required.</li> </ul>		
	<ul> <li>b. If the resource is significant, the PI shall submit an Archaeological Data Recovery Program (ADRP) which has been reviewed by the Native American consultant/monitor, and obtain written approval from MMC. Impacts to significant resources must be mitigated before ground disturbing activities in the area of discovery will be allowed to resume. Note: If a unique archaeological site is also an historical resource as defined in CEQA, then the limits on the amount(s) that a project applicant may be required to pay to cover mitigation costs as indicated in CEQA Section 21083.2 shall not apply.</li> </ul>		
	c. If the resource is not significant, the PI shall submit a letter to MMC indicating that artifacts will be collected, curated, and documented in the Final Monitoring Report. The letter shall also indicate that that no further work is required.		

	Table 10-1		
	Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program		
Potential Significant Impact	Mitigation Measures	Timeframe of Mitigation	Monitoring, Enforcement, and Reporting Responsibility
	IV. Discovery of Human Remains		
	If human remains are discovered, work shall halt in that area and no soil shall be exported off-site until a determination can be made regarding the provenance of the human remains; and the following procedures as set forth in CEQA Section 15064.9(e), the California Public Resources Code (Sec. 5097.98) and State Health and Safety Code (Sec. 7050.5) shall be undertaken:		
	A. Notification		
	<ol> <li>Archaeological Monitor shall notify the RE or BI as appropriate, MMC, and the PI, if the Monitor is not qualified as a PI. MMC will notify the appropriate Senior Planner in the EAS of the Development Services Department to assist with the discovery notification process.</li> </ol>		
	2. The PI shall notify the Medical Examiner after consultation with the RE, either in person or via telephone.		
	B. Isolate discovery site		
	<ol> <li>Work shall be directed away from the location of the discovery and any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlay adjacent human remains until a determination can be made by the Medical Examiner in consultation with the PI concerning the provenance of the remains.</li> </ol>		
	<ol> <li>The Medical Examiner, in consultation with the PI, will determine the need for a field examination to determine the provenance.</li> </ol>		
	<ol> <li>If a field examination is not warranted, the Medical Examiner will determine with input from the PI, if the remains are or are most likely to be of Native American origin.</li> </ol>		

Table 10-1           Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program			
Potential Significant Impact	Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program Mitigation Measures	Timeframe of Mitigation	Monitoring, Enforcement, and Reporting Responsibility
i otentiai signineane impace	C. If Human Remains <b>ARE</b> determined to be Native American		Responsibility
	1. The Medical Examiner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) within 24 hours. By law, <b>ONLY</b> the Medical Examiner can make this call.		
	<ol> <li>NAHC will immediately identify the person or persons determined to be the Most Likely Descendent (MLD) and provide contact information.</li> </ol>		
	<ol> <li>The MLD will contact the PI within 24 hours or sooner after the Medical Examiner has completed coordination, to begin the consultation process in accordance with CEQA Section 15064.9(e), the California Public Resources and Health &amp; Safety Codes.</li> </ol>		
	<ol> <li>The MLD will have 48 hours to make recommendations to the property owner or representative, for the treatment or disposition with proper dignity, of the human remains and associated grave goods.</li> </ol>		
	5. Disposition of Native American Human Remains will be determined between the MLD and the PI, and, if:		
	a. The NAHC is unable to identify the MLD, OR the MLD failed to make a recommendation within 48 hours after being notified by the Commission; OR;		
	<ul> <li>b. The landowner or authorized representative rejects the recommendation of the MLD and mediation in accordance with PRC 5097.94 (k) by the NAHC fails to provide measures acceptable to the landowner, THEN,</li> </ul>		

	Table 10-1		
	Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program		Monitoring, Enforcement, and Reporting
Potential Significant Impact	Mitigation Measures	Timeframe of Mitigation	Responsibility
	c. In order to protect these sites, the Landowner shall do one or more of the following:		
	(1) Record the site with the NAHC;		
	(2) Record an open space or conservation easement on the site;		
	(3) Record a document with the County.		
	d. Upon the discovery of multiple Native American human remains during a ground disturbing land development activity, the landowner may agree that additional conferral with descendants is necessary to consider culturally appropriate treatment of multiple Native American human remains. Culturally appropriate treatment of such a discovery may be ascertained from review of the site utilizing cultural and archaeological standards. Where the parties are unable to agree on the appropriate treatment measures the human remains and buried with Native American human remains shall be reinterred with appropriate dignity, pursuant to Section 5.c., above.		
	D. If Human Remains are <b>NOT</b> Native American		
	1. The PI shall contact the Medical Examiner and notify them of the historic era context of the burial.		
	2. The Medical Examiner will determine the appropriate course of action with the Pl and City staff (PRC 5097.98).		

	Table 10-1			
Potential Significant Impact	Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program Mitigation Measures	Timeframe of Mitigation	Monitoring, Enforcement, and Reporting Responsibility	
	<ol> <li>If the remains are of historic origin, they shall be appropriately removed and conveyed to the San Diego Museum of Man for analysis. The decision for internment of the human remains shall be made in consultation with MMC, EAS, the applicant/landowner, any known descendant group, and the San Diego Museum of Man.</li> </ol>			
	V. Night and/or Weekend Work			
	A. If night and/or weekend work is included in the contract			
	<ol> <li>When night and/or weekend work is included in the contract package, the extent and timing shall be presented and discussed at the precon meeting.</li> </ol>			
	2. The following procedures shall be followed.			
	a. No Discoveries			
	In the event that no discoveries were encountered during night and/or weekend work, the PI shall record the information on the CSVR and submit to MMC via fax by 8 a.m. of the next business day.			
	b. Discoveries			
	All discoveries shall be processed and documented using the existing procedures detailed in Sections III - During Construction, and IV – Discovery of Human Remains. Discovery of human remains shall always be treated as a significant discovery.			
	Table 10-1 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program			
-------------------------------	--	-------------------------	--	--
Potential Significant Impact	Mitigation Measures	Timeframe of Mitigation	Monitoring, Enforcement, and Reporting Responsibility	
i otentiai signinearit impact	c. Potentially Significant Discoveries		Responsionity	
	If the PI determines that a potentially significant discovery has been made, the procedures detailed under Section III - During Construction and IV – Discovery of Human Remains shall be followed.			
	d. The PI shall immediately contact MMC, or by 8 a.m. of the next business day to report and discuss the findings as indicated in Section III-B, unless other specific arrangements have been made.			
	<ul> <li>B. If night and/or weekend work becomes necessary during the course of construction</li> </ul>			
	1. The Construction Manager shall notify the RE, or BI, as appropriate, a minimum of 24 hours before the work is to begin.			
	2. The RE, or BI, as appropriate, shall notify MMC immediately.			
	C. All other procedures described above shall apply, as appropriate.			

	Table 10-1			
	Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program			
Potential Significant Impact	Mitigation Measures	Timeframe of Mitigation	Monitoring, Enforcement, and Reporting Responsibility	
	VI. Post Construction			
	A. Preparation and Submittal of Draft Monitoring Report			
	<ol> <li>The PI shall submit two copies of the Draft Monitoring Report (even if negative), prepared in accordance with the Historical Resources Guidelines (Appendix C/D) which describes the results, analysis, and conclusions of all phases of the Archaeological Monitoring Program (with appropriate graphics) to MMC for review and approval within 90 days following the completion of monitoring. It should be noted that if the PI is unable to submit the Draft Monitoring Report within the allotted 90-day timeframe resulting from delays with analysis, special study results or other complex issues, a schedule shall be submitted to MMC establishing agreed due dates and the provision for submittal of monthly status reports until this measure can be met.</li> </ol>			
	a. For significant archaeological resources encountered during monitoring, the Archaeological Data Recovery Program shall be included in the Draft Monitoring Report.			
	b. Recording Sites with State of California Department of Parks and Recreation			
	The PI shall be responsible for recording (on the appropriate State of California Department of Park and Recreation forms—DPR 523 A/B) any significant or potentially significant resources encountered during the Archaeological Monitoring Program in accordance with the City's Historical Resources Guidelines, and submittal of such forms to the South Coastal Information Center with the Final Monitoring Report.			

	Table 10-1 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program		
Potential Significant Impact	Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program	Timeframe of Mitigation	Monitoring, Enforcement, and Reporting Responsibility
r otential significant impact	<ol> <li>MMC shall return the Draft Monitoring Report to the PI for revision or, for preparation of the Final Report.</li> </ol>		Responsibility
	3. The PI shall submit revised Draft Monitoring Report to MMC for approval.		
	4. MMC shall provide written verification to the PI of the approved report.		
	5. MMC shall notify the RE or BI, as appropriate, of receipt of all Draft Monitoring Report submittals and approvals.		
	B. Handling of Artifacts		
	1. The PI shall be responsible for ensuring that all cultural remains collected are cleaned and catalogued		
	<ol> <li>The PI shall be responsible for ensuring that all artifacts are analyzed to identify function and chronology as they relate to the history of the area; that faunal material is identified as to species; and that specialty studies are completed, as appropriate.</li> </ol>		
	3. The cost for curation is the responsibility of the property owner.		
	C. Curation of artifacts: Accession Agreement and Acceptance Verification		
	<ol> <li>The PI shall be responsible for ensuring that all artifacts associated with the survey, testing and/or data recovery for this project are permanently curated with an appropriate institution. This shall be completed in consultation with MMC and the Native American representative, as applicable.</li> </ol>		

	Table 10-1 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program		
Potential Significant Impact	Mitigation Measures	Timeframe of Mitigation	Monitoring, Enforcement, and Reporting Responsibility
i otentia significant impact	<ol> <li>The PI shall include the Acceptance Verification from the curation institution in the Final Monitoring Report submitted to the RE or BI and MMC.</li> </ol>		Responsioney
	3. When applicable to the situation, the PI shall include written verification from the Native American consultant/monitor indicating that Native American resources were treated in accordance with state law and/or applicable agreements. If the resources were reinterred, verification shall be provided to show what protective measures were taken to ensure no further disturbance occurs in accordance with Section IV – Discovery of Human Remains, Subsection 5.		
	D. Final Monitoring Report(s)		
	<ol> <li>The PI shall submit one copy of the approved Final Monitoring Report to the RE or BI as appropriate, and one copy to MMC (even if negative), within 90 days after notification from MMC that the draft report has been approved.</li> </ol>		
	<ol> <li>The RE shall, in no case, issue the Notice of Completion and/or release of the Performance Bond for grading until receiving a copy of the approved Final Monitoring Report from MMC which includes the Acceptance Verification from the curation institution.</li> </ol>		

	Table 10-1 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program			
Potential Significant Impact Paleontological Resources	Mitigation Measures	Timeframe of Mitigation	Monitoring, Enforcement, and Reporting Responsibility	
Paleontological Resources         High and Moderate Resource Potential         Implementation of the project has the potential to result in significant impacts to paleontological resources, as grading is proposed within formation of high paleontological sensitivity (Scripps and Ardath formations).	<ul> <li>PALEO-1:</li> <li>I. Prior to Permit Issuance <ul> <li>A. Entitlements Plan Check</li> </ul> </li> <li>1. Prior to issuance of any construction permits, including, but not limited to, the first Grading Permit, Demolition Plans/Permits and Building Plans/Permits or a Notice to Proceed for Subdivisions, but prior to the first preconstruction meeting, whichever is applicable, the Assistant Deputy Director (ADD) Environmental designee shall verify that the requirements for Paleontological Monitoring have been noted on the appropriate construction documents.</li> <li>B. Letters of Qualification have been submitted to ADD</li> <li>1. The applicant shall submit a letter of verification to the City Mitigation Monitoring Coordination (MMC) identifying the principal investigator (PI) for the project and the names of all persons involved in the paleontological monitoring program, as defined in the City Paleontology Guidelines.</li> <li>2. MMC will provide a letter to the applicant confirming the qualifications of the PI and all persons involved in the paleontological monitoring of the project.</li> <li>3. Prior to the start of work, the applicant shall obtain approval from MMC for any personnel changes associated with the</li> </ul>	Prior to the issuance of a permit.	City of San Diego	

		Table 10-1 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program		
Potential Significant Impact		Mitigation Measures	Timeframe of Mitigation	Monitoring, Enforcement, and Reporting Responsibility
	II.	Prior to Start of Construction		
		A. Verification of Records Search		
		1. The PI shall provide verification to MMC that a site specific records search has been completed. Verification includes, but is not limited to, a copy of a confirmation letter from San Diego Natural History Museum, other institution or, if the search was in-house, a letter of verification from the PI stating that the search was completed.		
		<ol> <li>The letter shall introduce any pertinent information concerning expectations and probabilities of discovery during trenching and/or grading activities.</li> </ol>		
		B. PI Shall Attend Precon Meetings		
		<ol> <li>Prior to beginning any work that requires monitoring; the Applicant shall arrange a precon meeting that shall include the PI, construction manager (CM) and/or grading contractor (GC), resident engineer (RE), building inspector (BI), if appropriate, and MMC. The qualified paleontologist shall attend any grading/excavation related Precon Meetings to make comments and/or suggestions concerning the Paleontological Monitoring program with the CM and/or GC.</li> </ol>		
		a. If the PI is unable to attend the precon meeting, the Applicant shall schedule a focused precon meeting with MMC, the PI, RE, CM, or BI, if appropriate, prior to the start of any work that requires monitoring.		

	Table 10-1 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program	
Potential Significant Impact	Mitigation Measures Timeframe of Mitigatio 2. Identify Areas to be Monitored	Monitoring, Enforcement, and Reporting n Responsibility
	Prior to the start of any work that requires monitoring, the PI shall submit a Paleontological Monitoring Exhibit (PME) based on the appropriate construction documents (reduced to 11x17) to MMC identifying the areas to be monitored, including the delineation of grading/excavation limits. The PME shall be based on the results of a site specific records search as well as information regarding existing known soil conditions (native or formation).	
	<ol> <li>When Monitoring Will Occur</li> <li>a. Prior to the start of any work, the PI shall also submit a construction schedule to MMC through the RE indicating when and where monitoring will occur.</li> </ol>	
	b. The PI may submit a detailed letter to MMC prior to the start of work or during construction requesting a modification to the monitoring program. This request shall be based on relevant information such as review of final construction documents which indicate conditions such as depth of excavation and/or site graded to bedrock, presence or absence of fossil resources, etc., which may reduce or increase the potential for resources to be present.	

	Table 10-1 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program		
Potential Significant Impact	Mitigation Measures	Timeframe of Mitigation	Monitoring, Enforcement, and Reporting Responsibility
	III. During Construction		
	A. Monitor Shall be Present During Grading/ Excavation/ Trenching		
	<ol> <li>The monitor shall be present full-time during grading/excavation/trenching activities as identified on the PME that could result in impacts to formations with high and moderate resource sensitivity. The CM is responsible for notifying the RE, PI, and MMC of changes to any construction activities such as in the case of a potential safety concern within the area being monitored. In certain circumstances Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) safety requirements may necessitate modification of the PME.</li> </ol>		
	2. The PI may submit a detailed letter to MMC during construction requesting a modification to the monitoring program when a field condition, such as trenching activities, do not encounter formational soils as previously assumed, and/or when unique/unusual fossils are encountered which may reduce or increase the potential for resources to be present.		
	<ol> <li>The monitor shall document field activity via the Consultant Site Visit Record (CSVR). The CSVRs shall be faxed by the CM to the RE the first day of monitoring, the last day of monitoring, monthly (Notification of Monitoring Completion), and in the case of ANY discoveries. The RE shall forward copies to MMC.</li> </ol>		

	Table 10-1		
	Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program		
Detential Significant Impact	Mitigation Moasuros	Timeframe of Mitigation	Monitoring, Enforcement, and Reporting Responsibility
Potential Significant Impact	Mitigation Measures B. Discovery Notification Process	Timeframe of Mitigation	Responsibility
	<ol> <li>In the event of a discovery, the paleontological monitor shall direct the contractor to temporarily divert trenching activities in the area of discovery and immediately notify the RE or BI, as appropriate.</li> </ol>		
	2. The monitor shall immediately notify the PI (unless monitor is the PI) of the discovery.		
	3. The PI shall immediately notify MMC by phone of the discovery, and shall also submit written documentation to MMC within 24 hours by fax or e-mail with photos of the resource in context, if possible.		
	C. Determination of Significance		
	1. The PI shall evaluate the significance of the resource.		
	<ul> <li>a. The PI shall immediately notify MMC by phone to discuss significance determination and shall also submit a letter to MMC indicating whether additional mitigation is required. The determination of significance for fossil discoveries shall be at the discretion of the PI.</li> </ul>		
	b. If the resource is significant, the PI shall submit a Paleontological Recovery Program (PRP) and obtain written approval from MMC. Impacts to significant resources must be mitigated before ground disturbing activities in the area of discovery will be allowed to resume.		

	Table 10-1		
	Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program		
Potential Significant Impact	Mitigation Measures	Timeframe of Mitigation	Monitoring, Enforcement, and Reporting Responsibility
	c. If a resource is not significant (e.g., small pieces of broken common shell fragments or other scattered common fossils), the PI shall notify the RE, or BI as appropriate, that a non-significant discovery has been made. The Paleontologist shall continue to monitor the area without notification to MMC unless a significant resource is encountered.		
	d. The PI shall submit a letter to MMC indicating that fossil resources will be collected, curated, and documented in the final monitoring report. The letter shall also indicate that no further work is required.		
	IV. Night and/or Weekend Work		
	A. If night and/or weekend work is included in the contract.		
	<ol> <li>When night and/or weekend work is included in the contract package, the extent and timing shall be presented and discussed at the precon meeting.</li> </ol>		
	2. The following procedures shall be followed.		
	a. No Discoveries		
	In the event that no discoveries were encountered during night and/or weekend work, the PI shall record the information on the CSVR and submit to MMC via fax by 8 A.M. on the next business day.		
	b. Discoveries		
	All discoveries shall be processed and documented using the existing procedures detailed in Section III — During Construction.		

	Table 10-1 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program		
Potential Significant Impact	Mitigation Measures	Timeframe of Mitigation	Monitoring, Enforcement, and Reporting Responsibility
	c. Potentially Significant Discoveries		
	If the PI determines that a potentially significant discovery has been made, the procedures detailed under Section III — During Construction shall be followed.		
	d. The PI shall immediately contact MMC, or by 8 A.M. on the next business day, to report and discuss the findings as indicated in Section III-B, unless other specific arrangements have been made.		
	B. If night work becomes necessary during the course of construction.		
	<ol> <li>The CM shall notify the RE or BI, as appropriate, a minimum of 24 hours before the work is to begin.</li> </ol>		
	2. The RE or BI, as appropriate, shall notify MMC immediately.		
	C. All other procedures described above shall apply, as appropriate.		
	V. Post Construction		
	A. Preparation and Submittal of Draft Monitoring Report		
	<ol> <li>The PI shall submit two copies of the draft monitoring report (even if negative), prepared in accordance with the Paleontological Guidelines, which describes the results, analysis, and conclusions of all phases of the Paleontological Monitoring Program (with appropriate graphics) to MMC for review and approval within 90 days following the completion of monitoring,</li> </ol>		
	<ul> <li>For significant paleontological resources encountered during monitoring, the PRP shall be included in the draft monitoring report.</li> </ul>		

	Table 10-1		
	Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program		
Potential Significant Impact	Mitigation Measures b. Recording Sites with the San Diego Natural History Museum	Timeframe of Mitigation	Monitoring, Enforcement, and Reporting Responsibility
	The PI shall be responsible for recording (on the appropriate forms) any significant or potentially significant fossil resources encountered during the Paleontological Monitoring Program in accordance with the City's Paleontological Guidelines, and submittal of such forms to the San Diego Natural History Museum with the final monitoring report.		
	2. MMC shall return the draft monitoring report to the PI for revision or, for preparation of the final report.		
	3. The PI shall submit revised draft monitoring report to MMC for approval.		
	4. MMC shall provide written verification to the PI of the approved report.		
	5. MMC shall notify the RE or BI, as appropriate, of receipt of all draft monitoring report submittals and approvals.		
	B. Handling of Fossil Remains		
	<ol> <li>The PI shall be responsible for ensuring that all fossil remains collected are cleaned and catalogued.</li> </ol>		
	<ol> <li>The PI shall be responsible for ensuring that all fossil remains are analyzed to identify function and chronology as they relate to the geologic history of the area, that faunal material is identified as to species, and that specialty studies are completed, as appropriate.</li> </ol>		

Table 10-1 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program			
Potential Significant Impact	Mitigation Measures	Timeframe of Mitigation	Monitoring, Enforcement, and Reporting Responsibility
	C. Curation of fossil remains: Deed of Gift and Acceptance Verification		Responsibility
	1. The PI shall be responsible for ensuring that all fossil remains associated with the monitoring for this project are permanently curated with an appropriate institution.		
	<ol><li>The PI shall include the acceptance verification from the curation institution in the final monitoring report submitted to the RE or BI and MMC.</li></ol>		
	D. Final Monitoring Report(s)		
	<ol> <li>The PI shall submit two copies of the final monitoring report to MMC (even if negative) within 90 days after notification from MMC that the draft report has been approved.</li> </ol>		
	<ol> <li>The RE shall, in no case, issue the Notice of Completion until receiving a copy of the approved final monitoring report from MMC which includes the Acceptance Verification from the curation institution.</li> </ol>		



# Chapter 11 References Cited

### Bayerisches Landesamt für Umwelt

2007 (Parkplatzlarmstudie 6) Parking Area Noise, Recommendation for the Calculation of Sound Emissions of Parking Areas, Motorcar Centers and Bus Stations as well as Multi-Storey Car Parks and Underground Car Parks. 6. Revised Edition.

### Beier, P. and S. Loe

1992 A Checklist for Evaluating Impacts to Wildlife Movement Corridors. Wildlife Society Bulletin. 20:434-440.

### Bull, Charles, and David Hanna

1978 Site form for CA-SDI-5613. On file at the South Coastal Information Center, San Diego.

### California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)

2002 Guide for Preparation of Traffic Impact Studies.

### Carrico, Richard L.

1987 Strangers in a Stolen Land. American Indians in San Diego 1850-1880. Sierra Oaks Publishing, Newcastle, California.

### Cline, Lora L.

- 1948a Just Before Dawn. L. C. Enterprises, Tombstone, Arizona.
- 1948b Just Before Sunset. J and L Enterprises, Jacumba, California.

### Cook, Sherburne F.

1976 *The Population of California Indians, 1769-1970.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Deméré, Thomas and Stephen Walsh

1994 County of San Diego Paleontological Resources.

### Federal Highways Administration (FHWA)

2011 Highway Traffic Noise: Analysis and Abatement Guidance. FHWA-HEP-10-025. December 2011.

### Hector, Susan M., and Stephen R. Van Wormer

1986 Broken Fragments of Past Lifeways: Archaeological Excavations at Los Peñasquitos Ranch House, Volumes I and II. RECON.

#### May, Ron

- 1976 An Early Ceramic Date Threshold in Southern California. Masterkey 50(3):103 107.
- 1978 A Southern California Indigenous Ceramic Typology: A Contribution to Malcolm J. Rogers Research. ASA Journal 2:2.

#### Meighan, Clement W.

1954 A Late Complex in Southern California Prehistory. *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology* 10:215-227.

### Nationwide Environmental Title Research LLC

2013 Historic Aerials. http://www.historicaerials.com/ Accessed on March 6, 2013.

#### Navcon Engineering

2015 SoundPLAN Essential version 3.0.

#### Pourade, Richard F. (editor)

1963 *The Silver Dons.* The History of San Diego. Union-Tribune Publishing, San Diego, California.

### RECON Environmental, Inc.

2016 Biological Technical Report for the Campus Point Project, Cailin <sup>or</sup>Meara, August 24.

### Rogers, Malcolm J.

- 1938 Archaeological and Geological Investigations of the Culture Levels in an Old Channel of San Dieguito Valley. *Carnegie Institution of Washington Yearbook* 37:344-45.
- 1939 Early Lithic Industries of the Lower Basin of the Colorado River and Adjacent Desert Areas. San Diego Museum of Man Papers 3.
- 1945 An Outline of Yuman Prehistory. *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology* 1(2):167-198. Albuquerque.

### Rolle, Andrew

1998 California: A History. Harlan Davidson, Inc. Wheeling, Illinois.

Ryan Companies US

2015 RiverView Brewery Odor, Noise & Hours of Operation Exhibit. July 30.

### San Diego, City of

- 1996 Development Services Director Resolution No. D-405, Cancelling Planned Industrial Development Permit No. 91-0360. Recorded at the County of San Diego on December 6, 1996. Document #1996-0613237.
- 1997a City Manager Resolution No. D-484, Planned Industrial Development Permit No. 96-0743. Recorded at the County of San Diego on May 28, 1997. Document #. 1997-0245549.
- 1997b City of San Diego Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) Subarea Plan. March.
- 2005 Environmental Impact Report Guidelines. Updated December.
- 2011 Significance Determination Thresholds. California Environmental Quality Act. Development Services Department. January 2011.
- 2012 San Diego Municipal Code Land Development Code: Biology Guidelines. April
- 2014 San Diego Municipal Code Chapter 14 General Regulations, Article 2 General Development Regulations. July.

### San Diego, County of

2011 Significance Determination Thresholds. California Environmental Quality Act. January.

### True, Delbert L.

1970 *Investigation of a Late Prehistoric Complex in Cuyamaca Rancho State Park, San Diego County, California.* Department of Anthropology Publications, University of California, Los Angeles.

### U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)

1997 Coastal California Gnatcatcher (*Polioptila californica californica*) Presence/Absence Survey Protocol. July.

### Warren, Claude N., Gretchen Siegler, and Frank Dittmer

1993 Paleoindian and Early Archaic Periods. In *Historic Properties Background Study for the City of San Diego Clean Water Program.* On file with Mooney and Associates.



# Chapter 12 Individuals and Agencies Consulted

Agencies and individuals contacted during preparation of the EIR include the following:

## City of San Diego

## **Development Services Department, Land Development Review**

- Elizabeth Shearer-Nguyen, Senior Planner
- John Fisher, Development Project Manager

## Plan - MSCP

• Holly Smit-Kicklighter

## Plan – Long Range Planning

Dan Monroe

## LDR - Transportation Development

- Ann French Gonsalves, Senior Traffic Engineer
- Eddmond Alberto, Associate Engineer—Traffic

## **Police Department**

- Dawn M. Summers, Lieutenant, Operational Support Division
- Michael Swanson, Acting Lieutenant, Operational Support

## **Fire Rescue Safety**

• Lawrence Trame, Assistant Fire Marshal



# Chapter 13 Certification

This document has been completed by the City of San Diego's Environmental Analysis Section under the direction of the Development Services Department Deputy Director and is based on independent analysis and determinations made pursuant to the San Diego Land Development Code Section 128.0103.

A list of contributing City and consultant staff members, their titles and affiliations, is provided below.

# City of San Diego

## **Development Services**

- Kerry Santoro, Interim Deputy Director
- Elizabeth Shearer-Nguyen, EAS
- John Fisher, Development Project Manager
- Ann Gonsalves, Transportation
- Eddmont Alberto, Transportation
- Jack Canning, LDR Engineering
- Jim Quinn, LDR Geology
- Terre Lien, LDR Landscaping
- Conan Murphy, Planning Review

## **Planning Department**

- Dan Monroe, Plan-Long Range
- Holly Smit-Kicklighter, MSCP
- Frank January, Facilities Financing

## SDPD

• Josua Odom

## Fire Rescue Safety

• Larry Trame

## **Environmental Services Department**

- Lisa Wood
- Burton Ewert

## **RECON Environmental, Inc.**

### **Environmental Analysis and Report Preparation**

- Bobbi Herdes, Principal
- Lance Unverzagt, Senior Project Manager
- Stephanie Morgan-Whitmore, Senior Environmental Analyst
- Valerie Mattos, Environmental Analyst
- Jennifer Domeier, Environmental Analyst
- Jessica Fleming, Environmental Analyst
- Kevin Israel, Research Assistant
- Eija Blocker, Production Specialist
- Stacey Higgins, Senior Production Specialist
- Jennifer Gutierrez, Production Specialist
- Frank McDermott, GIS Manager
- Sean Bohac, GIS Specialist
- Chris Nixon, Graphics

## **Archaeological Resources Report**

- Carmen Zepeda-Herman, Project Archaeologist
- Harry Price, Project Archaeologist

## Air Quality Technical Report

- William Maddux, Senior Technical Specialist
- Jessica Fleming, Environmental Analyst

## **Noise Technical Report**

- William Maddux, Senior Technical Specialist
- Jessica Fleming, Environmental Analyst

## **Greenhouse Gas Technical Report**

- William Maddux, Senior Technical Specialist
- Jessica Fleming, Environmental Analyst

## **Biological Technical Report**

- Gerry Scheid, Senior Biologist
- Cailin O'Meara, Biologist

# Gensler

## Architect

- Steven Schrader, AIA
- Veit Kugel, AIA

# **Michael Baker International**

## **Civil Engineer**

• Brian Oliver, P.E.

## Hydrology and Hydraulic Basis of Design

• Richard S. Tomlinson, Jr. P.E. QSD

## Water Quality Technical Report

• Richard S. Tomlinson, Jr. P.E. QSD

## Lastras de Gertler

## Landscape Architect

• Rocio Lastras de Gertler, ASLA, RLA, LEED

# Urban Systems Associates, Inc.

## **Traffic Impact Analysis**

• Justin Schlaefli, Vice President

# Geocon, Inc.

## **Geotechnical and Geologic Fault Investigation**

- Rodney C. Mikesell, Registered Professional Engineer
- Garry Wells Cannon, Certified Engineering Geologist