



THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO

MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Project No. 432759
SCH No. N/A

SUBJECT: **WASHINGTON PLACE NDP**

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

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

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

3/27/17 - Since Distribution of this Draft document, it was realize this standard process was not provided and needed to be incorporated into final version:

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

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

is required to avoid a significant environmental impact. The modifications within the environmental document do not affect the environmental analysis or conclusions of the Mitigated Negative Declaration.

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

V. MITIGATION, MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Qualified 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) # 432759 and /or Environmental Document # 432759, shall conform to the mitigation requirements contained in the associated Environmental Document and implemented to the satisfaction of the DSD's Environmental Designee (MMC) and the City Engineer (RE). The requirements may not be reduced or changed but may be annotated (i.e. to explain when and how compliance is being met and location of verifying proof, etc.). Additional clarifying information may also be added to other relevant plan sheets and/or specifications as appropriate (i.e., specific locations, times of monitoring, methodology, etc

Note:

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

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

Not Applicable

4. MONITORING EXHIBITS

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

NOTE:

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

5. OTHER SUBMITTALS AND INSPECTIONS:

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

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 Preconstruction Meeting
Biological Resources	Biological Construction Mitigation/Monitoring Exhibit (BCME)	Approval by MMC
Biological Resources	Avian Protection - Pre-construction survey	Within 10 Calendar Days prior to the start of construction activities (including removal of vegetation)
Biological Resources	Resource Delineation	Prior to Construction Activities
Biological Resources	Education	Prior to commencement of Construction Activities
Biological Resources	Consultant Site Visit Record (CSV)	Monitoring During Construction
Biological Resources	Final BCME/Report	Within 30 days of Construction Completion
Bond Release	Request for a Bond Release Letter	Final MMRP Inspections Prior to Bond Release Letter

C. SPECIFIC MMRP ISSUE AREA CONDITIONS/REQUIREMENTS

MSCP SUBAREA PLAN -LAND USE ADJACENCY GUIDELINES

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 (CD's/CD's consist of Construction Plan Sets for Private 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 CD's 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 impactful 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. 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 consistent 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); Least Bell's vireo (3/15-9/15); and Southwestern Willow Flycatcher (5/1-8/30) (select only the species that apply). 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)

1. Prior to the issuance of any grading permit, the City Manager (or appointed designee) shall verify that the Multi-Habitat Planning Area (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 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:
 - 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; AND
 - 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 CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES DURING THE BREEDING SEASON, AREAS RESTRICTED FROM SUCH ACTIVITIES SHALL BE STAKED OR FENCED UNDER THE SUPERVISION OF A QUALIFIED BIOLOGIST; OR

- 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. 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.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCE PROTECTION DURING CONSTRUCTION

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 any native/migratory birds, 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 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.).

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 1st day of monitoring, the 1st 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.

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

VI. PUBLIC REVIEW DISTRIBUTION:

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

CITY OF SAN DIEGO

Mayor's Office

Councilmember Ward - District 3

City Attorney's Office (93C)

Development Services:

Development Project Manager

LDR - Engineering Review

LDR - EAS

LDR - Geology

LDR - Landscaping

LDR - Planning Review

Park and Recreation (89)

MSCP Reviewer, MS-5A

MMC, MS-1102B (77A)

Facilities Financing (93B)

Water Review (86A)

Wastewater Review (86B)

San Diego Central Library (81A)

Mission Hills Library (81Q)

OTHER ORGANIZATIONS AND INTERESTED PARTIES

Mission Hills Association (327)

AECOM (178)

Citizens Coordinate for Century 3 (179)

EC Allison Research Center (181)

Endangered Habitats League (182A)

San Diego Tracking Team (187)

Sierra Club - San Diego Chapter (165)

Neighborhood Canyon Creek & Park Groups (165A)

San Diego Audubon Society (167)

Calif. Native Plant Society (170)

Middletown Property Owner's Assoc. (496)

Mission Hills Heritage (497)

Uptown Planners (498)

Hillside Protection Association (501)

Banker's Hill Canyon Assoc. (502)

Bob Ruscin (Du Charme Architecture), Applicant
David L. Lysinger, Owner

VII. RESULTS OF PUBLIC REVIEW:

- (X) 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.
- () 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.

Copies of the draft Mitigated Negative Declaration, the Mitigation, Monitoring and Reporting Program and any Initial Study material are available in the office of the Entitlements Division for review, or for purchase at the cost of reproduction.


MARK BRUNETTE
SENIOR PLANNER
Development Services Department

2/23/2017
Date of Draft Report

4/3/17
Date of Final Report

Analyst: CHRIS TRACY, AICP, ASSOCIATE PLANNER

Attachments: Figure 1 – Location Map
Figure 2 – Site Plan
Initial Study Checklist



Location Map

Washington Place NDP/Project No. 432759

Address – 1826 & 1836 Washington Place

City of San Diego – Development Services Department

FIGURE

No. 1



No. 2

INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

1. Project title/Project number: Washington Place NDP / 432759
2. Lead agency name and address: City of San Diego, 1222 First Avenue, MS-501, San Diego, California 92101
3. Contact person and phone number: Chris Tracy, AICP, Associate Planner / (619) 446-5381
4. Project location: 1826 & 1836 Washington Place (APN: 431-631-01 and -02) San Diego, CA 92103
5. Project Applicant/Sponsor's name and address: Bob Ruscin, Du Charme Architecture, 7742 Herschel Avenue, Suite H, San Diego, CA 92037
6. General/Community Plan designation: Residential/Park, Open-Space, and Recreation / Uptown Community Plan: Residential - Low: 5-9 DU/AC, Open-Space
7. Zoning: RS-1-1 & RS-1-7 (Residential Single-Family)
8. Description of project (Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to, later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation.):

NEIGHBORHOOD DEVELOPMENT PERMIT (Process 2) to demolish two existing single dwelling units and construct a two-story over basement, single dwelling unit totaling 7,231 square feet. The 0.31-acre site is located at 1826 Washington Place in the RS-1-1 and RS-1-7 zone(s) of the Uptown Community Plan area within Council District 3.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting: Briefly describe the project's surroundings:

The 0.31 acre project site encompasses two existing lots located at 1826 and 1836 Washington Place. The lot at 1826 currently has an existing one-story 1,154 square-foot residence, and the lot at 1836 currently has an existing one-story 747 square-foot residence. Associated site improvements (hardscape and landscaping) exist at both parcels. The site is bounded by Washington Street to the east, Banker's Hill Open Space Trail Park to the west, an existing residence to the south, and an existing residence to the north. The topography of the site is approximately 229.8 above Mean Sea Level (CAMS) at the westernmost corner and 267.9

AMSL in the easternmost corner. The surrounding land uses immediately adjacent to the project site are residential to the north, south, and east, and park, open space, & recreation west. North and south of the site is zoned RS-1-1/RS-1-7, east of the site is RS-1-7, and west is RS-1-1 and OP-1-1 (Open-Space).

In addition, the project site is located in the Airport Influence Area (AIA) Review Area 2 for the San Diego International Airport (SDIA) as depicted in the adopted 2014 Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) and the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Part 77 Notification Area. The subject parcel is situated in a neighborhood setting of similar uses. The project is located in a developed area currently served by existing public services and utilities.

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.):

None required.

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

Yes a Native American Tribe traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area has requested consultation with the City of San Diego pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21082.3 (c). The City has been in consultation with this tribe. However, the project is located in an urbanized and developed area where it was determined in consultation with the tribe that monitoring would not be required pursuant to AB 52.

Note: Conducting consultation early in the CEQA process allows tribal governments, lead agencies, and project proponents to discuss the level of environmental review, identify and address potential adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources, and reduce the potential for delay and conflict in the environmental review process. (See Public Resources Code section 21083.3.2.) Information may also be available from the California Native American Heritage Commission's Sacred Lands File per Public Resources Code section 5097.96 and the California Historical Resources Information System administered by the California Office of Historic Preservation. Please also note that Public Resources Code section 21082.3(c) contains provisions specific to confidentiality.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

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

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- ☐ The proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☒ Although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☐ The proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- ☐ The proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect (a) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (b) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- ☐ Although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or (MITIGATED) NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or (MITIGATED) NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis.)
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) “Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from “Earlier Analyses”, as described in (5) below, may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or (mitigated) negative declaration. *Section 15063(c)(3)(D)*. In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a. Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b. Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c. Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “Less Than Significant With Mitigation Measures Incorporated”, describe the mitigation measures that were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
- 7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project’s environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
- 9) The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a. The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b. The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significant.

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

I) AESTHETICS – Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

No designated public viewsheds and/or scenic corridors designated per the Uptown Community Plan (Figure 4-3: Canyons and Views) exist on the site. Therefore, the project would not result in a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

No such scenic resources or state scenic highways are located on, near, or adjacent to the site. Therefore, the project would not result in a substantial adverse effect on a scenic resource.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The demolition of the two residences and the construction of the single-dwelling residence would be compatible and is permitted by the community plan and zoning designation and would not substantially degrade the existing visual character of the neighborhood in comparison to the two residences that exist at the site. Furthermore the project will provide on-site landscaping features in the rear (native landscaping), which will help provide a visual transition from the adjacent natural open space and sensitive resource area. Therefore, any impacts would be less than significant.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

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

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

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

Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. – Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Converts Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The Uptown Community Plan designates the project site for Residential - Low: 5-9 DU/AC. The project is consistent with the community plan and would not result in the conversion of prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of statewide importance (farmland). Agricultural land is not present on the site or in the general site vicinity. No impacts would result.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Refer to II (a) The project is consistent with the community plan and zone, therefore not resulting in a conflict with the Williamson Act Contract. The site is not designated or zoned for agricultural use; the Uptown Community Plan designates the project site for Residential - Low: 5-9 DU/AC. Agricultural land is not present on the site or in the general vicinity of the site. No impacts would result.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 1220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The project is consistent with the community plan and zone. The project would not result in the rezoning of forestland or timberland. Forestland is not present on the site or in the general vicinity. No impacts would result.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Refer to II(c)

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| e) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				

The Uptown Community Plan designates the project site for Residential - Low: 5-9 DU/AC. The project would not involve any changes that would affect or result in the conversion of Farmland or forestland to non-agricultural or non-forest uses. The project is consistent with the community plan. Refer to II(a) and II(c). No impacts would result.

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

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

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

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

The project would construct a single-family residence within a developed neighborhood of similar residential uses. The project is consistent with the General Plan, community plan, and the underlying zoning for residential development. Therefore, the project would be Consistent at a

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

sub-regional level with the underlying growth forecasts in the RAQS, and would not obstruct implementation of the RAQS. As such, any impacts would be less than significant.

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

☐
☐
☒
☐

Short-term Emissions (Construction)

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

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

Long-term Emissions (Operational)

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

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

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

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

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

d) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Short-term (Construction)

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

Long-term (Operational)

Typical long-term operational characteristics of the project are not associated with the creation of such odors nor anticipated to generate odors affecting a substantial number of people. The project would construct a single-family residence. Residential dwelling units, in the long-term operation, are not typically associated with the creation of such odors nor are they anticipated to generate odors affecting a substantial number or people. Therefore, project operations would result in less than significant impacts.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have substantial adverse effects, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The following is a discussion concerning species as it relates to substantial adverse effects, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Specifically, these details were addressed within the submitted Biological Resources Report In summary:

Sensitive Vegetation Communities

Sensitive vegetation communities are those recognized by the City's MSCP (City of San Diego, 1997) as depleted, rare considered rare within the region, as known to support sensitive animal or plant species, and/or serving as important wildlife corridors. These habitats are typically rare throughout their ranges, or are highly localized and/or fragmented.

Sensitive Plants

No sensitive plant species were observed on the Washington Place Project site, and none would be expected, given the highly disturbed nature of the property. Sensitive plants known from the vicinity are presented in Attachment A.

Sensitive Animals

No sensitive animal species were observed on the Washington Place Project site, and none would be expected, given the highly disturbed nature of the property.

A few species of sensitive, wide-ranging animals have a moderate probability to utilize this property on at least an occasional basis. These might include various sensitive bats or raptors that could fly over or roost onsite on occasion. No occupied habitat or raptor nests were detected, however. One or two species of locally-abundant but sensitive reptiles, such as Coronado Skink (*Eumeces skiltonianus interparietalis*) and others could occur here in low numbers. In any case, no sensitive animal populations would depend on the resources provided by this small property. Sensitive animals known from the vicinity are presented in Attachment A.

Narrow Endemics

The City of San Diego recognizes a variety of "narrow endemics" within the MSCP, including the following: San Diego Thorn-mint (*Acanthomintha ilicifolia*), Shaw's Agave (*Agave shawii*), San Diego Ambrosia (*Ambrosia pumila*), Aphanisma (*Aphanisma blitoides*), Coastal Dunes Milk Vetch

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

(*Astragalus tener* var. *titi*), Short-Leaved Dudleya (*Dudleya brevifolia*), Variegated Dudleya (*Dudleya variegata*), Otay Tarplant (*Hemizonia conjugens*), Prostrate Navarretia (*Navarretia fossalis*), Snake Cholla (*Opuntia serpentina*), California Orcutt Grass (*Orcuttia californica*), San Diego Mesa Mint (*Pogogyne abramsii*), and Otay Mesa Mint (*Pogogyne nudiuscula*). Most of these occur in habitats, such as vernal pools, maritime sage scrub, coastal dunes, etc., not found on this property. In any case, no narrow endemics are anticipated to occur on the subject property. Three narrow endemics are known from open, herb dominated habitats: San Diego Thorn-mint, Otay Tarplant, San Diego Ambrosia. These are highly unlikely to occur on this property, as no occurrences are reported from the vicinity, and distinctive foliage/floral parts would likely been observed if the species' were present. Narrow endemics and other sensitive species known from the vicinity of this site are listed in Attachment A.

Wildlife Corridors

A local wildlife corridor is present adjacent to (west of) the Washington Place Project site in the form of an urban canyon. This canyon is part of the Mission Hills Park and has a hiking trail which travels the length of the canyon. No significant impacts to wildlife movement would result from the development of this site, as homes are present on adjoining parcels in a similar configuration, and two homes are already present within the footprint of the newly-proposed residence.

Direct Impacts

Grading and development of the Washington Place Project site as proposed will directly impact approximately 0.17 acre of Urban/Developed Habitat and 0.11 acre of Non-Native Vegetation. Onsite and offsite brush management should not affect biological resources due to the surrounding lands consisting of urban development with virtually no native vegetation. Also potentially impacted could be sensitive, wide-ranging species, such as sensitive bats, raptors, or reptiles (see Attachment A), which might be expected to utilize this property on an occasional basis.

Indirect Impacts

Due to the site's western edge being located within the MHPA (however this will be left undisturbed), Land Use Adjacency Mitigation Language (Lighting, Noise (Inclusive of California Gnatcatchers), Construction Activities) is required. This will address any indirect impacts that the project may have on the adjacent open-space to the west. (Scheidt, 2016)

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

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Refer to response IV (a) above. Per the Biological Resources Report for the project, no riparian habitat or other community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service is identified on-site with this project (Scheidt, 2016).

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

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

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

Per the Biological Report, "A local wildlife corridor is present adjacent to (west of) the Washington Place Project site in the form of an urban canyon. This canyon is part of the Mission Hills Park and has a hiking trail which travels the length of the canyon. No significant impacts to wildlife movement would result from the development of this site; however, as homes are present on adjoining parcels in a similar configuration, and two homes are already present within the footprint of the newly-proposed residence." (Scheidt, 2016) As such, any impacts would be less-than-significant through the implementation of the Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Program (MMRP), as detailed within Section V of the Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND). With implementation of the biological resources monitoring program, potential impacts on resources would be reduced to less than significant. Please refer to response IV (a) above as well.

e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				

The project would not conflict with any local policies and/or ordinances protecting biological resources such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance. Therefore, no impacts would result. Also refer to response IV (a) above.

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

Refer to response IV(a) above. The project site is located adjacent to the City's Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA). As such, the project must comply with the Land Use Adjacency Guidelines contained in Section 1.4.3 of the City's MSCP Subarea Plan. Specifically areas of lighting, drainage, landscaping, grading, noise, and access. All potential impacts related to the presence of biological resources at the site would be reduced and addressed through the implementation of the Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Program (MMRP), as detailed within Section V of the Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND). With implementation of the biological resources monitoring program, potential impacts on biological resources would be reduced to less than significant.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

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

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

Archaeological Resources

The project site was previously disturbed during construction of the two residences located at the site. Due to the extensive disturbance that has occurred on and adjacent to the property, there is

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

minimal potential for sub-surface resources to be unearthed during ground-disturbing activities. Based upon a review of the existing site conditions and the location of the project, there would be less-than-significant impacts to archaeological resources and mitigation is not required.

Built Environment

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

Building records and a photographic survey for the project site were submitted and reviewed by Plan-Historic staff for the existing residential structures. City staff determined that the property and/or structure is not an individually designated resource and is not located within a designated historic district. In addition, the property does not meet designation criteria as a significant resource under any adopted criteria. Therefore, no impacts would result.

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

See Response V(a). With extensive prior disturbance of the site, it was determined in communications with AB 52 Tribal Representatives that this project would not create a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5. Any impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation would be required.

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

According to the "Geology of the San Diego Metropolitan Area, California, Point Loma, 7.5 Minute Quadrangle Maps" (Kennedy and Peterson, 1975) the project site is located at the Linda Vista Formation (Qln) and San Diego Formation (Tsd); however, the geotechnical documentation for the project identifies artificial fill and the San Diego Formation.

The City's Significance Determination Thresholds state that monitoring is required when a depth of 10 feet and 1,000 cubic yards of excavation would be exceeded when a project is located on a formation that has a high sensitivity rating. The project proposes approximately 520 cubic yards of cut and 10 cubic yards of fill with a maximum depth of approximately 14 feet.

As a guideline dependent on grading history, paleontological monitoring may be required if project grading meets or exceeds the City's Thresholds of 1,000 cubic yards to 10 feet in depth for an area with a high sensitivity rating, such as the San Diego Formation (Tsd). This project falls below this threshold and is comprised mainly of artificial fill; therefore, the project does not have

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

the potential to disturb or destroy paleontological resources and therefore, does not exceed the threshold for paleontological monitoring. As such, impacts would be less than significant.

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

Refer to V(a). The proposed project site is not currently used as a cemetery and is not otherwise known to contain human remains. Furthermore, the project would not cause a substantial adverse on archaeological resource and disturbances to human remains would not occur.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS – Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: | | | | |
| i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

The site is not underlain by an active, potentially active, or inactive faulting. Nor is the project located within an Alquist-Priolo Fault Zone. The nearest known active fault is the Rose Canyon Fault, located one and half miles southwest of the site. These faults are the dominant source of potential ground motion. The estimated deterministic maximum earthquake magnitude and peak ground acceleration for the Rose Canyon Fault is 7.5 and 0.60g, respectively. The project would utilize proper engineering design and standard construction practices in order to ensure that potential impacts remain below a level of significance. Therefore, risks from rupture of a known earthquake fault would be less than significant.

- | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The site is located within Geologic Hazard Categories 52 as shown on the San Diego Seismic Safety Study Map 21. Geologic Hazard Category 52 is characterized as “other level areas, gently sloping to steep terrain, favorable geologic structure, low risk.” Proper engineering design and utilization of standard construction practices would be required and would ensure that impacts resulting from seismic ground shaking would be less than significant.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

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

As mentioned in response VI(a)(ii), the site is located in an area known to contain favorable geologic structure. The potential for liquefaction and seismically induced settlement occurring within the soils found on site is considered to be negligible due to the nature of the site formational units and the lack of groundwater. Proper engineering design and utilization of standard construction practices would be required and would ensure impacts resulting from liquefaction would not occur. Impacts do to seismic-related ground failure or liquefaction would be less than significant

iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
-----------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Due to the steep slopes present at the western portion of the site a slope stability analysis was performed. Per this analysis, inclusive of the Preliminary Geotechnical Engineering Report for Proposed Nicholas Residence, March 15, 2015, Christian Wheeler Engineering, "...the subject property is suitable for the construction of the proposed structures provided the recommendations presented herein are implemented." The recommendations within this report will be incorporated as project design measures, as such, and impacts to landsliding will less-than-significant.

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Construction activities such as excavation and grading may have the potential to cause soil erosion or loss of topsoil. Short-term erosion effects during the construction phase of the project would be prevented through required implementation of a Storm Water Pollution and the Soil Management Plan (SWPPP). The SWPPP would include standard construction methods such as temporary detention basins to control on-site and off-site erosion. With implementation of an approved SWPPP, impacts resulting from erosion during construction operations would remain below a level of significance. In addition, the contractor would be required to take remedial measures to prevent erosion of freshly-graded areas until such time as permanent drainage and erosion control features have been installed. Areas subjected to erosion or sedimentation shall be properly prepared prior to placing additional fill or structures. Impacts due to soil erosion or the loss of topsoil would be less than significant.

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

See response VI(a)(ii) and (iv). Impacts would be less than significant.

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Per the Preliminary Geotechnical Engineering, "As encountered in our subsurface explorations, the site is underlain by potentially compressible artificial fill, colluvium, topsoil, and subsoil extending to a maximum depth of about 4 feet below existing grade. These deposits are considered unsuitable, in their present condition, for the support of settlement sensitive improvements" (Christian Wheeler Engineering, 2015). The report further provides recommendations and project design features to address this concern. Based on this information and implementation of compaction recommendations, any impacts concerning this area of analysis would be less than significant.

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

The project does not propose the use of septic tanks. As a result, septic tanks or alternative wastewater systems would not be used. Therefore, no impacts with regard to the capability of soils to adequately support the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems would result.

VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS – Would the project:

a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

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

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

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

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

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

Per the Climate Action Plan (CAP) Consistency Checklist, the proposed project will have a less-than-significant impact on the environment, either directly or indirectly, because the proposed project is consistent with the existing General Plan and Community Plan land use and underlying zoning designations. The proposed project is located in low density residential land use designation and is within the RS-1-1 and RS-1-7 zones and meets the criteria for consistency with the General Plan, Community Plan land use and zoning designations. The project will provide roofing materials with a minimum 3-year aged solar reflection and thermal emittance or solar reflection index equal to or greater than the values specified in the voluntary measures under the California Green Building Standards Code; Provide only low-flow plumbing fixtures will be installed in the project that meet the following standards: Kitchen faucets: maximum flow rate not to exceed 1.5 gallons per minute at 60 psi; Standard dishwashers: 4.25 gallons per cycle; Compact dishwashers: 3.5 gallons per cycle; and Clothes washers: water factor of 6 gallons per cubic feet of drum capacity; Provide a 15% improvement over current code for low-rise residential as calculated by Compliance Software certified by the California Energy Commission, and provide listed cabinet connected to a raceway linking the required parking space to the electrical service, to allow for the future installation of electric vehicle supply equipment to provide an electric vehicle charging station for use by the resident.

As such, potential impacts from greenhouse gas emissions are considered less than significant and no mitigation measures are required; however, the improvements described within this checklist will required as a part of required project design features.

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Would the project:

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The project would result in the construction of a single-dwelling residence. Although minimal amounts of such substances may be present during construction, they are not anticipated to create a significant public hazard. Once constructed, due to the nature of the project, the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials on or through the subject site is not anticipated. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Refer to response VIII (a) above. Construction of a single-family residence within a neighborhood of similar uses would not be associated with such impacts. Therefore, no significant impacts related to this issue were identified, and no mitigation measures are required.

c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Refer to responses VIII (a) and VIII (b) above. The project site is within one quarter mile of a school, Grant Elementary School; however, future risk of releases of hazardous substances would not occur as a result of project operations because it is anticipated that future on-site operations would not require the routine use or transport of acutely hazardous materials.

Construction of the project may require the use of hazardous materials (fuels, lubricants, solvents, etc.), which would require proper storage, handling, use and disposal. Further, the project would

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

be required to comply with all federal, state and local requirements associated with the transportation of hazardous materials; therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

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

☐
☐
☐
☒

A hazardous waste site records search was completed on January 18, 2017, using "Geotracker" <https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/map/?CMD=runreport&myaddress=1826+Washington+Place%2C+San+Diego%2C+CA> The records search showed that no hazardous waste sites exist on-site or in the immediate surrounding area. No impacts would result.

- e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two mile of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

☐
☐
☐
☒

The project is located in the Airport Influence Area (AIA) Review Area 2 for the San Diego International Airport (SDIA) as depicted in the adopted 2014 Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP). The project is located outside of the 60 decibel (dB) Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) as depicted in the 2014 ALUCP. The project is not located in a Safety Zone, as depicted in the 2014 ALUCP; therefore, the use and density are both consistent with the ALUCP. The proposed development would not result in safety hazards for people residing or working in the project area. Impacts would not occur.

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

☐
☐
☐
☒

The project site is not in proximity to any private airstrip. Therefore, no significant impacts will occur, and no mitigation measures are required.

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

☐
☐
☐
☒

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

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

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

☐
☐
☐
☒

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

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY - Would the project:

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

☐
☐
☒
☐

The project would comply with all storm water quality standards during and after construction, and appropriate Best Management Practices (BMP's) with Low Impact Design (LID's) standards will be utilized and provided for on-site. Implementation of these BMP's would preclude any violations of existing standards and discharge regulations. As detailed within the approved "Priority Development Project (PDP) Storm Water Quality Management Plan (SWQMP) for The Washington Place Residence, 1826 Washington Place, San Diego, CA 92103", Coffey Engineering, Inc., December 15, 2016.

"4.0 Types of BMPs

4.1 Site Design/Low Impact Development BMPs

- Optimize the Site Layout - The proposed project will conserve the site's natural areas and vegetation along the rear yard hillside.
- Minimize Impervious Footprint - Extensive landscaping will be installed throughout the site.

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

- Disperse Runoff to Adjacent Landscaping – Runoff will be directed to landscaping. Hardscapes will be pitched to landscape wherever possible. Flows will travel through landscaped areas before being released from the site whenever possible.
- Construction Considerations - Soil compaction shall be minimized in landscaped areas. Soil amendments will be used to enhance and support continued vegetative growth. All basins are either considered self-treating or will be directed to the bioretention facility.
- Install energy dissipaters – There are no concentrated flows to the hillside. An energy dissipater will be installed in the bioretention area to reduce the velocity of the pumped flows from the lower level pump. An energy dissipater will not be necessary for the second pump, as the positioning of the D-25 curb outlet will decrease the velocity by disrupting the flow.
- Vegetate slopes with either native or drought tolerant vegetation – Landscaping of disturbed slopes is an important part to the aesthetic of the project and will be implemented.
- Convey runoff safely away from tops of slopes – Downspouts will collect storm water and direct it to the treatment device via sump pumps and sheet flow through landscape areas.
- Design and Implementation of Pervious Surfaces – Landscape.

....4.2 Source Control BMPs

(4.2.6) Efficient Irrigation - The irrigation system will be designed with sensitivity to each landscape area's water requirements (per CASQA BMP SD-12).

(4.2.7) Trash Storage - Trash containers will have attached lids to prevent trash contact with storm water (per CASQA BMP SD-32).

(4.2.8) Materials Storage – In the event that any landscaping or construction or any other material that could contaminate rainwater is stored onsite they will be stored in such a way as to eliminate contact with storm water. This includes but is not limited to: storing material above ground on pallets, using plastic covers, and employing secondary containment as needed (per CASQA BMP SD-34).

(4.2.10) Employ integrated pest management principles – Plants in landscaped areas will be chosen to prevent pests (either native or pest-resistant plants) to reduce the need for pesticide use.

(4.2.12) Design fire sprinkler system to discharge to sanitary sewer – If fire sprinkler system will be incorporated into the units all interior drains will be connected to the sanitary sewer per the California Building Code.

(4.2.13) Manage Air Conditioning Condensate – Air conditioning condensate shall be directed to adjacent landscaping.

(4.2.14) Use Non-Toxic Roofing Materials Where Feasible – The roof will be constructed with a non-toxic material. Metallic roofing will not be used.

(4.2.15) Other Source Control Requirements – Site shall be stabilized with landscaping wherever possible. Pet wastes (if any) shall be collected and disposed of in proper waste containers (trash cans).

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

*Numbers in parenthesis represent section within the City of San Diego Storm Water Standards Manual, Jan. 2012" (Coffey Engineering Inc., 2015).

This will be addressed through the project's Conditions of Approval; therefore, impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

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

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

The project does not require the construction of wells. The project is located within a developed residential neighborhood with existing public water supply infrastructure. No impacts would result.

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

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

The project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or the area. Although grading is proposed, the project would implement on-site BMPs, therefore ensuring that substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site would not occur. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

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

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

The project would implement low impact development principles ensuring that a substantial increase in the rate or amount of surface runoff resulting in flooding on or off-site, or a substantial alteration to the existing drainage pattern would not occur with the proper

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

implementation of BMPs. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

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

☐
☐
☒
☐

The project would comply with all City storm water quality standards during and after construction. Appropriate BMP's would be implemented to ensure that water quality is not degraded; therefore, ensuring that the project runoff is directed to appropriate onsite drainage systems. Due to the nature of the project, any runoff from the site is not anticipated to exceed the capacity of existing storm water systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff that would require new or expanded facilities. See IX(a) for additional discussion. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

- f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

☐
☐
☒
☐

The project would comply with all City storm water quality standards during and after construction. Appropriate BMP's would be implemented to ensure that water quality is not degraded. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

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

☐
☐
☐
☒

The project site is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area or any other known flood area.

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

☐
☐
☐
☒

See Response (IX)(g) above.

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING – Would the project:

- a) Physically divide an established community?

☐
☐
☐
☒

The project would be consistent with the General Plan land use designation of Residential as well as the Uptown Community Plan land use designations of Residential - Low: 5-9 DU/AC and Open-

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

Space. As described, the project is located within a developed residential neighborhood currently containing two residential units; therefore, would not physically divide an established community. No impact would result.

- b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

☐
☐
☐
☒

Refer to response X(a) above

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

☐
☒
☐
☐

The project site is located adjacent to the City's Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA). As such, the project must comply with the Land Use Adjacency Guidelines contained in Section 1.4.3 of the City's MSCP Subarea Plan. Specifically areas of lighting, drainage, landscaping, grading, noise, and access. All potential impacts related to the presence of biological resources at the site would be reduced and addressed through the implementation of the Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Program (MMRP), as detailed within Section V of the Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND). With implementation of the biological resources monitoring program, potential impacts on resources would be reduced to less than significant.

XI. MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the project?

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

☐
☐
☐
☒

There are no known mineral resources located on the project site. The site is classified as MRZ-3 (Mineral Resource Zone) as identified on Figure CE-6 of the City of San Diego's General Plan – Conservation Element. MRZ-3. The urbanized and developed nature of the project site and vicinity would preclude the extraction of any such resources. No impacts would result.

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

☐
☐
☐
☒

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

See response XI (a) above. The project site has not been delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan as a locally important mineral resource recovery site, and no such resources would be affected with project implementation. Therefore, no significant impacts were identified, and no mitigation measures are required.

XII. NOISE – Would the project result in:

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

Short Term

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

Long Term

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

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

See response XII (a) above. Potential effects from construction noise would be reduced through compliance with City restrictions. Pile driving activities that would potentially result in ground borne vibration or ground borne noise are not anticipated with construction of the project.

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

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

The project would not significantly increase long-term (ambient) noise levels. The project would not introduce a new land use or significantly increase the intensity of the allowed land use. Post-construction noise levels and traffic would be generally unchanged as compared to noise with the existing residential use. Therefore, no substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels is anticipated. A less than significant impact would result.

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

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

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| e) For a project located within an airport land use plan, or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport would the project expose people residing or working in the area to excessive noise levels? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The project is located outside of the 60 decibel (dB) Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) as depicted in the 2014 ALUCP. The proposed development would not result in safety hazards for people residing or working in the project area. Impacts would not occur.

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

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

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING – Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?				

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

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

The project site is located in a developed residential neighborhood with two existing single-family residential units. The overall number of units will be reduced from two to one with this proposal; however, in considering the scale of this project, it would not displace a substantial amount of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. As such, any impacts would be less-than-significant.

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

See response XIII (b) above. Any impacts would be less-than-significant.

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES

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

- | | | | | |
|--------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| i) Fire Protection | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The project site is located in an urbanized area where fire protection services are already provided. The Project site is located adjacent to the City's Multi-Habitat Preservation Area (MHPA), California State Park land, and within high fire sensitive area; therefore, a comprehensive Brush Management Plan must be established. Since the full Brush Management Zones cannot be provided entirely on-site, the proposed structures would have to meet alternative compliance measures. Alternative compliance measures are proposed to provide for fire rated walls and all openings shall incorporate dual glazed/dual tempered window panes. Additionally, all proposed landscaping adjoining the western portion of the site shall not use invasive plant species. Landscaping adjacent to these areas shall use plant species naturally occurring in that area. Construction of the project would not adversely affect existing levels of fire protection services to

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

the area, and would not require the construction of new, or expansion of, existing governmental facilities. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

ii) Police Protection	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
-----------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The project site is located in an urbanized and developed area within the City of San Diego where police protection services are already provided. Construction of the project would not adversely affect existing levels of police protection services to the area or create significant new demand for such services. Additionally, the project would not require the construction of new, or expansion of, existing governmental facilities. Any impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

iii) Schools	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The project site is located in an urbanized and developed area where public school services are available. The project would not significantly increase the demand on public schools over that which currently exists. Construction of the project is not anticipated to result in a significant increase in demand for public educational services. Any impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

v) Parks	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
----------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The project site is located in an urbanized and developed area where City-operated parks are available. The project would not significantly increase the demand on existing neighborhood or regional parks, or other recreational facilities, over that which presently exists. Construction of the project is not anticipated to result in a significant increase in demand for parks or other offsite recreational facilities. Any impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

vi) Other public facilities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
-----------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The project site is located in an urbanized and developed area where City services are already available. Construction of the project would not require the construction of new, or expansion of, existing governmental facilities. No impacts would result.

XV. RECREATION

a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

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

The project would construct a single-family residence in place of two existing residences; therefore, not adversely affect the availability of and/or need for new or expanded recreational resources. The project would not adversely affect existing levels of public services, and would not require the construction or expansion of an existing governmental facility. The project would not significantly increase the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities. Therefore, the project is not anticipated to result in the use of available parks or facilities such that substantial deterioration occurs, or that would require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities to satisfy demand. As such, no significant impacts related to recreational facilities have been identified, and no mitigation measures are required.

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

See response to XIV(a) above. The project does not propose recreation facilities, nor does it require the construction or expansion of any such facilities. No impacts would result.

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC – Would the project?

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Construction of the project would not change existing circulation patterns on area roadways; however, a temporary minor increase in traffic may occur during construction. The project would not conflict with any applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system. The project is not expected to cause a significant short- term or long-term increase in traffic volumes, and thus, would not adversely affect existing levels of service along area roadways. Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

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

standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

Refer to response XVI(a) above. Construction of the project would not generate additional vehicular traffic; in fact it may be reduced long-term, nor would it adversely affect any mode of transportation in the area; therefore, the project would not conflict with any applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system. Impacts are considered less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

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

☐
☐
☒
☐

The project would not result in a change to air traffic patterns as it is surrounded within an existing residential neighborhood with structures of a similar height. The project is located in the Airport Influence Area (AIA) Review Area 2 for the San Diego International Airport (SDIA) as depicted in the adopted 2014 Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP). It was determined the project would not create a safety risk. Any impacts would be less than significant.

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

☐
☐
☐
☒

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

- e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

☐
☐
☐
☒

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

- f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public

☐
☐
☐
☒

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?				

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

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

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

No tribal cultural resources as defined by Public Resources Code section 21074 have been identified on the project site. Furthermore, the project site was not determined to be eligible for listing on either the State or local register of historical resources.

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

No significant resources pursuant to subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1 have been identified on the project site.

XVIII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Implementation of the project would not interrupt existing sewer service to the project site or other surrounding uses. No increase in demand for wastewater disposal or treatment would be

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

created by the project, as compared to current conditions. The proposed residential unit is not anticipated to generate significant amounts of wastewater. Wastewater facilities used by the project would be operated in accordance with the applicable wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). Additionally, the project site is located in an urbanized and developed area. Adequate services are already available to serve the project. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

- b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

☐
☐
☒
☐

See response XVII(a) above. Adequate services are available to serve the project site. Additionally, the proposed residential unit would not significantly increase the demand for water or wastewater treatment services and thus, would not trigger the need for new treatment facilities. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

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

☐
☐
☒
☐

The project would not exceed the capacity of the existing storm water drainage systems and therefore, would not require construction of new or expansion of existing storm water drainage facilities of which could cause significant environmental effects. The project was reviewed by qualified City staff who determined that the existing facilities are adequately sized to accommodate the proposed development. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

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

☐
☐
☒
☐

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

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

☐
☐
☒
☐

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

Construction of the project would not adversely affect existing wastewater treatment services. Adequate services are available to serve the project site without requiring new or expanded entitlements. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

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

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

The project would comply with all Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. The project would not result in the generation of large amounts of solid waste, nor generate or require the transport of hazardous waste materials, other than minimal amounts generated during the construction phase. All demolition activities would comply with any City of San Diego requirements for diversion of both construction waste during the demolition phase and solid waste during the long-term, operational phase. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

XIX. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE –

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

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

As documented in this Initial Study, the project may have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, notably with respect to Land Use and Biological Resources. As such, mitigation measures have been incorporated to reduce impacts to less than significant.

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

As documented in this Initial Study, the project may have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, notably with respect to Land Use and Biological Resources, which may have cumulatively considerable impacts. As such, mitigation measures have been incorporated to reduce impacts to less than significant. Other future projects within the surrounding neighborhood or community would be required to comply with applicable local, State, and Federal regulations to reduce the potential impacts to less than significant, or to the extent possible. As such, the project is not anticipated to contribute potentially significant cumulative environmental impacts.

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

The construction of a new single-dwelling residence is consistent with the setting and with the use anticipated by the City. It is not anticipated that demolition or construction activities would create conditions that would significantly directly or indirectly impact human beings. Impacts would be less than significant.

INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

REFERENCES

I. Aesthetics / Neighborhood Character

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

II. Agricultural Resources & Forest Resources

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

III. Air Quality

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

IV. Biology

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

- ☒ Site Specific Report: "Biological Resources; the Washington Place Residential Project, City of San Diego", Vincent N. Scheidt, Biological Consultant, June 29, 2016

V. Cultural Resources (includes Historical Resources)

- ☒ City of San Diego Historical Resources Guidelines
- ☒ City of San Diego Archaeology Library
- ☐ Historical Resources Board List
- ☐ Community Historical Survey:
- ☐ Site Specific Report:

VI. Geology/Soils

- ☒ City of San Diego Seismic Safety Study
- ☐ U.S. Department of Agriculture Soil Survey - San Diego Area, California, Part I and II, December 1973 and Part III, 1975
- ☒ Site Specific Report: "Report of Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation, Nicholas Residence", Christian Wheeler Engineering, Inc., March 20, 2015

VII. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

- ☒ Site Specific Report: Climate Action Plan (CAP) Checklist, 432759/Washington Place NDP, January 31, 2017

VIII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

- ☒ San Diego County Hazardous Materials Environmental Assessment Listing
- ☒ State Water Resources Control Board GeoTracker: <http://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/> January 18, 2017.
- ☐ San Diego County Hazardous Materials Management Division
- ☐ FAA Determination
- ☐ State Assessment and Mitigation, Unauthorized Release Listing, Public Use Authorized
- ☒ Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan

___ Site Specific Report:

IX. Hydrology/Water Quality

X Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM)

X Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), National Flood Insurance Program-Flood Boundary and Floodway Map

___ Clean Water Act Section 303(b) list, http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/tmdl/303d_lists.html

X Site Specific Report: "Priority Development Project (PDP) Storm Water Quality Management Plan (SWQMP), Nicholas Residence", Coffey Engineering, Inc., September 28, 2015.

X. Land Use and Planning

X City of San Diego General Plan

X Community Plan: Uptown

X Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan

X City of San Diego Zoning Maps

___ FAA Determination

___ Other Plans:

XI. Mineral Resources

X City of San Diego General Plan

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

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

___ Site Specific Report:

XII. Noise

X City of San Diego General Plan

___ Community Plan

X San Diego International Airport - Lindbergh Field CNEL Maps

___ Brown Field Airport Master Plan CNEL Maps

- ☐ Montgomery Field CNEL Maps
- ☐ San Diego Association of Governments - San Diego Regional Average Weekday Traffic Volumes
- ☐ San Diego Metropolitan Area Average Weekday Traffic Volume Maps, SANDAG
- ☒ Site Specific Report:

XIII. Paleontological Resources

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

XIV. Population / Housing

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

XV. Public Services

- ☒ City of San Diego General Plan
- ☐ Community Plan

XVI. Recreational Resources

- ☒ City of San Diego General Plan

- ☒ Community Plan: Uptown
- ☐ Department of Park and Recreation
- ☐ City of San Diego - San Diego Regional Bicycling Map
- ☐ Additional Resources:

XVII. Transportation / Circulation

- ☒ City of San Diego General Plan
- ☐ Community Plan
- ☐ San Diego Metropolitan Area Average Weekday Traffic Volume Maps, SANDAG
- ☐ San Diego Region Weekday Traffic Volumes, SANDAG
- ☐ Site Specific Report:

XVIII. Utilities

- ☒ City of San Diego General Plan

XIX. Water Conservation

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

Created: REVISED - October 11, 2013