

ADDENDUM TO A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO

Project No. 479840 Addendum to MND No. 6107 SCH No. 2003101089

SUBJECT: ALMAZON LOT 207: A SITE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT to construct a 2,900-square-foot single-family residence with attached 480-square-foot garage and 149-square-feet of outdoor patio space. Various site improvements would also be constructed that include retaining walls, and associated hardscape and landscape. The project would conform to the Affordable/In-Fill Housing and Sustainable Buildings Expedite Program by generating 50 percent or more of the projected total energy consumption on site through renewable energy resources (i.e. photovoltaic). The vacant 0.649 acre project site is located at 11470 Almazon Street. The project site is designated Low Density Residential (0 - 1dwelling unit per acre) and within the RS-1-14 zone (Residential – Single Unit, requires minimum 5,000-square-foot lots). Additionally, the project site is within the Airport Land Use Compatibility Overlay Zone (Marine Corps Air Station (MCAS) Miramar), the Airport Influence Area (MCAS Miramar, Review Area 2), and the Rancho Penasquitos Community Plan. (LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Lot 207 according to Map No. 6982.) Applicant: Will Rogers and Associates

#### I. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant is requesting a SITE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT to construct a 2,900-square-foot singlefamily residence with attached 480-square-foot garage and 149-square-feet of outdoor patio space. The project would also construct various site improvements, including retaining walls, and associated hardscape and landscaping. The project would conform to the Affordable/In-Fill Housing and Sustainable Buildings Expedite Program by generating 50 percent or more of the projected total energy consumption on site through renewable energy resources (i.e. photovoltaic).

The project landscaping has been reviewed by City Landscape staff and would comply with all applicable City of San Diego Landscape ordinance and standards. Drainage would be directed into appropriate storm drain systems designated to carry surface runoff, which has been reviewed and accepted by City Engineering staff. Ingress to the project site would be via Almazon Street. All parking would be provided on-site.

Grading operations for the project would entail 162 cubic yards of cut and a maximum depth of cut of five feet. 162 cubic yards of fill and a maximum depth of fill of three feet is also proposed.

#### II. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The vacant 0.649 acre project site is located at 11470 Almazon Street. The project site is designated Low Density Residential (0 - 1dwelling unit per acre) and within the RS-1-14 zone (Residential – Single Unit, requires minimum 5,000-square-foot lots). Additionally, the project site is within the Airport Land Use Compatibility Overlay Zone (Marine Corps Air Station (MCAS) Miramar), the Airport Influence Area (MCAS Miramar, Review Area 2), and the Rancho Penasquitos Community Plan.

The project site is located on the north side of Almazon Street, east of Paymongo Street. The project site slopes to the south with inclinations ranging from relatively level area to the south to slopes averaging approximately 2.1:1 (horizontal:vertical) over the majority of the site. The project site is undeveloped supporting mostly natural vegetation with the exception of a disturbed area adjacent to Almazon Street where a storage crate is staged. The project site is bound by undeveloped land and a utility pole to the north, a residential property to the east, Almazon Street and residential development to the south. Additionally, the project site is situated in a developed area currently serviced by existing public services and utilities.

# III. PROJECT BACKGROUND

The project site is located on Lot 207 that is part of the original Almazon Residences project, which consisted of a seven-lot development (Lots 205 through 211) totaling approximately 4.51 acres. The Almazon Residences project was previously analyzed under Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) No. 6107. As approved under MND No. 6107, each lot would construct a single-dwelling unit with garage and associated site improvements. The Almazon Residences project grading included approximately 6,878 cubic yards of cut to a maximum of 14 feet, and 701 cubic yards of fill at a maximum height of six feet. Six retaining walls were required. Landscaping was provided in accordance with the City's Landscape Standards.

The Almazon Residences project identified significant impacts to biological resources, paleontological resources, and hydrology and water quality. A mitigation, monitoring, and reporting program was prepared to identify mitigation measures to reduce environmental impacts to below a level of significance.

The current project, Almazon Lot 207, does not result in new impacts that would require new mitigation; therefore, an Addendum to MND No. 6107 has been prepared.

# IV. ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

The City previously prepared and certified the **Almazon Residences Mitigated Negative Declaration (No. 6107 / SCH No. 2003101089).** Based on all available information in light of the entire record, the analysis in this Addendum, and pursuant to Section 15162 of the State CEQA Guidelines, the City has determined the following:

• There are no substantial changes proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous environmental document due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;

- Substantial changes have not occurred with respect to the circumstances under which the
  project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous environmental
  document due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial
  increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or
- There is no new information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous environmental document was certified as complete or was adopted, shows any of the following:
  - a. The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous environmental document;
  - b. Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous environmental document;
  - c. Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or
  - d. Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous environmental would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

Based upon a review of the current project, none of the situations described in Sections 15162 and 15164 of the State CEQA Guidelines apply. There are no substantial changes to the project, no changes in circumstances have occurred, and no new information of substantial importance has manifested, which result in new significant or substantially increased adverse impacts as a result of the project. Therefore, this Addendum has been prepared in accordance with Section 15164 of the CEQA State Guidelines. Public review of this Addendum is not required per CEQA.

# V. IMPACT ANALYSIS

The subsequent impact analysis is to demonstrate that environmental impacts associated with the project are consistent with the previously certified MND. The following includes the project-specific environmental review pursuant to the CEQA. The analysis in this document evaluates the adequacy of the MND relative to the project.

## Hydrology/Water Quality

## Almazon Residences

Water quality impacts of the Almazon Residences (MND No. 6107) project were determined to be potentially significant. Specifically, it was determined that the project may result in potentially significant impacts to water quality primarily from (1) oils and grease from the driveways; (2) sediments, fertilizers, and pesticides from landscaped areas; and (3) sediment and soil erosion

during construction grading. The MND concluded that implementation of mitigation measures, construction and post-construction Best Management Practices (BMP's) to minimize and control runoff carrying pollutants that could create potentially significant impacts to downstream water bodies, would be required.

#### Project

A site-specific Water Quality Study (Will Rogers & Associates, March 2017) and Drainage Study (Bajoua Engineering Co, September 2016) were prepared for the project. Due to current City of San Diego Municipal Code requirements related to Hydrology and Water Quality, the project would be required to comply with all storm water quality standards during and after construction, and appropriate Best Management Practices (BMPs) would be utilized. Implementation of these BMPs, have been reviewed and accepted by qualified City staff, would preclude any violations of existing standards and discharge regulations. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

# **Biological Resources**

#### Almazon Residences

A field survey was conducted and a biological report (Affinis 2003) was prepared for the original Almazon Residences project that identified impacts to approximately 0.52 acre of disturbed habitat (Tier IV) and 0.60 acre of coastal sage scrub (Tier II) within the foot print of the project site. Mitigation was identified that required the applicant to either acquire 0.60 acre of habitat within the City's Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA) or pay into the City Habitat Acquisition Fund.

# Project

A Biological Letter Report for the project was prepared by Klutz Biological Consulting dated March 13, 2017. Lot 207 was re-surveyed to determine if any significant biological changes had occurred since the original report was prepared. Habitat on-site is comprised of disturbed habitat and Diegan coastal sage scrub, consistent with habitat mapping previously conducted in 2003 for the Almazon Residences project. Although the habitats identified are the same, a comparison of the Almazon Residences project and the current project was conducted. It was determined that the current project would impact approximately 0.02 acres of Diegan coastal sage scrub beyond what was originally anticipated. The previous project footprint would have impacted 0.03 acre of Diegan coastal sage scrub and 0.11 acre of disturbed habitat. The current project would result in impacts to 0.05 acre of Diegan coastal sage scrub and 0.11 acre of disturbed habitat. The revised BMZ 2 under the current project would impact an additional 0.10 acre of Diegan coastal sage scrub; however, BMZ 2 is impact neutral per the City's Biological Guidelines (2012).

The technical report further determined that although the potential exists for coastal California gnatcatcher, coast horned lizard, rosy boa, red-diamond rattlesnake, Coronado Island skink, and orange-throated whiptail lizard, impacts to potentially occupied habitat are located outside the City's MHPA. Therefore, impacts would not be considered significant and species specific mitigation requirements would not be required.

Impacts subject to mitigation (Tier II habitat within the development footprint & BMZ 1) equal 0.05acre or 2,070 square feet. The project would be required to mitigate these impacts at a 1:1 ratio. At this ratio, 0.05 acres of mitigation will be required. Appropriate mitigation would be to pay into the City's Habitat Acquisition Fund (Fund #10571) at an amount determined by City Staff to be sufficient to accomplish mitigation. The mitigation for this project is consistent with the mitigation previously identified in the City's Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) No. 6107 (City of San Diego 2013).

As discussed earlier, the previously certified MND identified mitigation measures for impacts to all seven lots consistent with the City's Biological Guidelines. The current project, which is comprised of Lot 207, would be required to adhere to the mitigation measures identified in the original certified environmental document.

Therefore, a Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Program as detailed in Section V of the Addendum would be implemented. With implementation of the MMRP, impacts to biological resources would be reduced to below a level of significance.

#### Paleontological Resources

#### Almazon Residences

The Almazon Residences MND determined that the project is underlain by Santiago Peak Volcanic Formation, which is assigned a moderate paleontological resource sensitivity rating. Impacts would be considered significant if more than 2,000 cubic yards of soil cut at a maximum depth of 10 feet or more would occur. The Updated Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation (Petra, December 2002) identified Santiago Peak Formation at a depth of five feet to 30 feet below ground surface. The project's proposed grading could therefore result in significant identified impacts to buried fossil resources within the Santiago Peak Formation.

The MND included paleontological monitoring measures to reduce the impact to below a level of significance.

#### Project

Per the site-specific Geotechnical Investigation prepared by Belfast Engineering LLC dated May 18, 2016, the project site is underlain by Colluvium, Mission Valley Formation, and Santiago Peak Formation. Colluvium underlies the project site from the surface to approximately four feet. Mission Valley Formation underlies the project site from approximately two feet to six feet. Santiago Peak Formation appears to underlie the project site in the extreme northwest corner of the planned structure. The current project would be required to adhere to the mitigation measures identified in the original certified environmental document.

Therefore, a Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Program as detailed in Section V of the Addendum would be implemented. With implementation of the MMRP, impacts to paleontological resources would be reduced to below a level of significance.

# VI. MITIGATION, MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (MMRP) INCORPORATED INTO THE PROJECT

The project shall be required to comply with applicable mitigation measures outlined within the MMRP of the previously certified MND (No. 6107/SCH No. 2003101089) and the project-specific subsequent technical studies. The following MMRP identifies measures that specifically apply to this project.

# 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/information/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 Paleontological Monitor

#### 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) #<u>479840</u> and /or Environmental Document #<u>479840</u>, 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 or at Preconstruction Meeting			
Biology	Biologist Limit of Work Verification	Limit of Work Inspection			
Paleontology	Paleontology Reports	Paleontology Site Observation			
Bond Release	Request for Bond Release Letter	Final MMRP Inspections Prior to Bond Release Letter			

# C. SPECIFIC MMRP ISSUE AREA CONDITIONS/REQUIREMENTS

#### **BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES (HABITAT ACQUISTION FUND)**

Prior to a Notice to Proceed for any construction permits, including but not limited to, the first Grading Permit, Demolition Plans/Permits, and Building Plans/Permits, the owner/permittee shall contribute to the City of San Diego Habitat Acquisition Fund (HAF) to mitigate for the loss of 0.05 acre of coastal sage scrub (Tier II). This fee is based on mitigation ratios per the City of San Diego Biology Guidelines, of 1:1 ratio if mitigation would occur inside of the Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA) and a 1.5:1 ratio should mitigation occur outside of the MHPA. Therefore, the resulting total mitigation required for direct project impacts to coastal sage scrub would be 0.05 acre inside the MHPA or 0.075 acres outside the MHPA equivalent monetary contribution to the City's HAF plus a 10 percent administrative fee.

# PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

#### I. Prior to Permit Issuance

- A. Entitlements Plan Check
  - Prior to issuance of any construction permits, including but not limited to, the first Grading Permit, Demolition Plans/Permits and Building Plans/Permits or a Notice to Proceed for Subdivisions, but prior to the first preconstruction meeting, whichever is applicable, the Assistant Deputy Director (ADD) Environmental designee shall verify that the requirements for Paleontological Monitoring have been noted on the appropriate construction documents.
- B. Letters of Qualification have been submitted to ADD
  - 1. The applicant shall submit a letter of verification to Mitigation Monitoring Coordination (MMC) identifying the Principal Investigator (PI) for the project and the

names of all persons involved in the paleontological monitoring program, as defined in the City of San Diego Paleontology Guidelines.

- 2. MMC will provide a letter to the applicant confirming the qualifications of the PI and all persons involved in the paleontological monitoring of the project.
- 3. Prior to the start of work, the applicant shall obtain approval from MMC for any personnel changes associated with the monitoring program.

# II. Prior to Start of Construction

- A. Verification of Records Search
  - 1. The PI shall provide verification to MMC that a site specific records search has been completed. Verification includes, but is not limited to a copy of a confirmation letter from San Diego Natural History Museum, other institution or, if the search was inhouse, a letter of verification from the PI stating that the search was completed.
  - 2. The letter shall introduce any pertinent information concerning expectations and probabilities of discovery during trenching and/or grading activities.
- B. PI Shall Attend Precon Meetings
  - Prior to beginning any work that requires monitoring; the Applicant shall arrange a Precon Meeting that shall include the PI, Construction Manager (CM) and/or Grading Contractor, Resident Engineer (RE), Building Inspector (BI), if appropriate, and MMC. The qualified paleontologist shall attend any grading/excavation related Precon Meetings to make comments and/or suggestions concerning the Paleontological Monitoring program with the Construction Manager and/or Grading Contractor.
    - a. If the PI is unable to attend the Precon Meeting, the Applicant shall schedule a focused Precon Meeting with MMC, the PI, RE, CM or BI, if appropriate, prior to the start of any work that requires monitoring.
  - 2. Identify Areas to be Monitored

Prior to the start of any work that requires monitoring, the PI shall submit a Paleontological Monitoring Exhibit (PME) based on the appropriate construction documents (reduced to 11x17) to MMC identifying the areas to be monitored including the delineation of grading/excavation limits. The PME shall be based on the results of a site specific records search as well as information regarding existing known soil conditions (native or formation).

- 3. When Monitoring Will Occur
  - a. Prior to the start of any work, the PI shall also submit a construction schedule to MMC through the RE indicating when and where monitoring will occur.
  - b. The PI may submit a detailed letter to MMC prior to the start of work or during construction requesting a modification to the monitoring program. This request shall be based on relevant information such as review of final construction documents which indicate conditions such as depth of excavation and/or site graded to bedrock, presence or absence of fossil resources, etc., which may reduce or increase the potential for resources to be present.

# III. During Construction

- A. Monitor Shall be Present During Grading/Excavation/Trenching
  - 1. The monitor shall be present full-time during grading/excavation/trenching activities as identified on the PME that could result in impacts to formations with high and moderate resource sensitivity. **The Construction Manager is responsible for**

notifying the RE, PI, and MMC of changes to any construction activities such as in the case of a potential safety concern within the area being monitored. In certain circumstances OSHA safety requirements may necessitate modification of the PME.

- 2. The PI may submit a detailed letter to MMC during construction requesting a modification to the monitoring program when a field condition such as trenching activities that do not encounter formational soils as previously assumed, and/or when unique/unusual fossils are encountered, which may reduce or increase the potential for resources to be present.
- 3. The monitor shall document field activity via the Consultant Site Visit Record (CSVR). The CSVR's shall be faxed by the CM to the RE the first day of monitoring, the last day of monitoring, monthly (**Notification of Monitoring Completion**), and in the case of ANY discoveries. The RE shall forward copies to MMC.
- B. Discovery Notification Process
  - 1. In the event of a discovery, the Paleontological Monitor shall direct the contractor to temporarily divert trenching activities in the area of discovery and immediately notify the RE or BI, as appropriate.
  - 2. The Monitor shall immediately notify the PI (unless Monitor is the PI) of the discovery.
  - 3. The PI shall immediately notify MMC by phone of the discovery, and shall also submit written documentation to MMC within 24 hours by fax or email with photos of the resource in context, if possible.
- C. Determination of Significance
  - 1. The PI shall evaluate the significance of the resource.
    - a. The PI shall immediately notify MMC by phone to discuss significance determination and shall also submit a letter to MMC indicating whether additional mitigation is required. The determination of significance for fossil discoveries shall be at the discretion of the PI.
    - b. If the resource is significant, the PI shall submit a Paleontological Recovery Program (PRP) and obtain written approval from MMC. Impacts to significant resources must be mitigated before ground disturbing activities in the area of discovery will be allowed to resume.
    - c. If resource is not significant (e.g., small pieces of broken common shell fragments or other scattered common fossils) the PI shall notify the RE, or BI as appropriate, that a non-significant discovery has been made. The Paleontologist shall continue to monitor the area without notification to MMC unless a significant resource is encountered.
    - d. The PI shall submit a letter to MMC indicating that fossil resources will be collected, curated, and documented in the Final Monitoring Report. The letter shall also indicate that no further work is required.

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

- A. If night and/or weekend work is included in the contract
  - 1. When night and/or weekend work is included in the contract package, the extent and timing shall be presented and discussed at the precon meeting.
  - 2. The following procedures shall be followed.
    - a. No Discoveries

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

- Discoveries
   All discoveries shall be processed and documented using the existing procedures detailed in Sections III - During Construction.
- c. Potentially Significant Discoveries If the PI determines that a potentially significant discovery has been made, the procedures detailed under Section III - During Construction shall be followed.
- d. The PI shall immediately contact MMC, or by 8AM on the next business day to report and discuss the findings as indicated in Section III-B, unless other specific arrangements have been made.
- B. If night work becomes necessary during the course of construction
  - 1. The Construction Manager shall notify the RE, or BI, as appropriate, a minimum of 24 hours before the work is to begin.
  - 2. The RE, or BI, as appropriate, shall notify MMC immediately.
- C. All other procedures described above shall apply, as appropriate.

## V. Post Construction

- A. Preparation and Submittal of Draft Monitoring Report
  - The PI shall submit two copies of the Draft Monitoring Report (even if negative), prepared in accordance with the Paleontological Guidelines which describes the results, analysis, and conclusions of all phases of the Paleontological Monitoring Program (with appropriate graphics) to MMC for review and approval within 90 days following the completion of monitoring,
    - a. For significant paleontological resources encountered during monitoring, the Paleontological Recovery Program shall be included in the Draft Monitoring Report.
    - Recording Sites with the San Diego Natural History Museum
       The PI shall be responsible for recording (on the appropriate forms) any significant or potentially significant fossil resources encountered during the Paleontological Monitoring Program in accordance with the City's Paleontological Guidelines, and submittal of such forms to the San Diego Natural History Museum with the Final Monitoring Report.
  - 2. MMC shall return the Draft Monitoring Report to the PI for revision or, for preparation of the Final Report.
  - 3. The PI shall submit revised Draft Monitoring Report to MMC for approval.
  - 4. MMC shall provide written verification to the PI of the approved report.
  - 5. MMC shall notify the RE or BI, as appropriate, of receipt of all Draft Monitoring Report submittals and approvals.
- B. Handling of Fossil Remains
  - 1. The PI shall be responsible for ensuring that all fossil remains collected are cleaned and catalogued.
  - 2. The PI shall be responsible for ensuring that all fossil remains are analyzed to identify function and chronology as they relate to the geologic history of the area; that faunal material is identified as to species; and that specialty studies are completed, as appropriate

- C. Curation of fossil remains: Deed of Gift and Acceptance Verification
  - 1. The PI shall be responsible for ensuring that all fossil remains associated with the monitoring for this project are permanently curated with an appropriate institution.
  - 2. The PI shall include the Acceptance Verification from the curation institution in the Final Monitoring Report submitted to the RE or BI and MMC.
- D. Final Monitoring Report(s)
  - 1. The PI shall submit two copies of the Final Monitoring Report to MMC (even if negative), within 90 days after notification from MMC that the draft report has been approved.
  - 2. The RE shall, in no case, issue the Notice of Completion until receiving a copy of the approved Final Monitoring Report from MMC which includes the Acceptance Verification from the curation institution.

# VII. IMPACT SIGNIFICANCE

The MND identified that all impacts would be mitigated to below a level of significance through mitigation. This Addendum also identifies that all significant project impacts would be mitigated to below a level of significance, consistent with the previously certified MND. The proposed project would not result in any additional significant impacts nor would it result in an increase in the severity of impacts from that described in the previously certified MND.

## VIII. CERTIFICATION

Copies of the addendum, the final MND, the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, and associated project-specific technical appendices, if any, may be reviewed in the office of the Development Services Department, or purchased for the cost of reproduction.

E. Shearer-Nguyen, Senior Planner Development Services Department

May 22, 2017 Date of Final Report

Analyst: L. Sebastian

Attachments:

Figure 1: Vicinity Map Figure 2: Site Plan Mitigated Negative Declaration No. 6107 / SCH No. 2003101089





**Vicinity Map** <u>Almazon Lot 207 / Project No. 479840</u> City of San Diego – Development Services Department FIGURE

No. 1





# Site Plan

<u>Almazon Lot 207 / Project No. 479840</u> City of San Diego – Development Services Department FIGURE



# **Mitigated Negative Declaration**

Land Development Review Division (619) 446-5460

Project No. 6107 SCH No. (Pending)

- SUBJECT: <u>Almazon Residences</u>. SITE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT (SDP No. 10179) to grade seven (7) contiguous undeveloped lots and construct seven (7) individual single-family residences. The entire 4.51-acres project site is comprised of seven legal lots (Lots 205 through 211 of the Peñasquitos Glens Subdivision) and is located along the north side of Almazon Street, between Andorra Way and Paymogo Street, within the Rancho Peñasquitos Community Planning Area. Applicant: James Freitas.
- 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): biological resources, paleontological resources, and hydrology/water quality. Subsequent revisions in the project proposal create the specific mitigation identified in Section V of this Mitigated Negative Declaration. The project as revised now avoids or mitigates the potentially significant environmental effects previously identified, and the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report will not be required.

IV. DOCUMENTATION:

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

V. MITIGATION, MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM:

# General

1. After project approval by the Decision-maker and prior to issuance of any discretionary approval(s), the applicant shall submit a deposit of **\$900.00** to the Development Project

Manager in Development Services Department to cover the City's costs associated with implementation of the Mitigation, Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP).

- 2. Prior to issuance of any construction permits, the owner/permittee shall make arrangements to schedule a pre-construction meeting to ensure implementation of the MMRP. The meeting shall include the Resident Engineer, the monitoring biologist, and staff from the City's Mitigation Monitoring Coordination (MMC) Section.
- 3. Prior to the issuance of any construction permits, the Environmental Review Manager (ERM) of the Land Development Review Division (LDR) shall verify the following mitigation measures are noted on a separate sheet of the construction/grading plans submitted and included in the specifications under the heading Environmental Mitigation Requirements.

#### **Biological Resources**

- 4. Prior to the issuance of the first grading permit, the Environmental Review Manager (ERM) of Land Development Review (LDR) Division shall verify that the applicant/permittee has mitigated for direct impacts of **0.60 acre** of coastal sage scrub habitat (Tier II) at the appropriate mitigation ratios defined by the City's Biological Resource Guidelines, by either one of the following measures:
  - A. The applicant shall acquire 0.60 acre of off-site upland habitat (Tiers I III) within the City of San Diego Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA) for impacts to 0.60 acre of coastal sage scrub (Tier II) habitat impacted by the proposed development. The applicant shall provide the ERM legal documentation (i.e. land title, deed, etc.) that verifies the appropriate upland habitat within the City's MHPA has been acquired in conformance with the City's Biological Guidelines. or-
  - B. The applicant shall pay into the City's Habitat Acquisition Fund the amount necessary to purchase 0.60 acre plus a 10 percent administration fee. Said payment is currently estimated at \$45,000 per acre for the Del Mar Mesa area.
- 5. Prior to the issuance of any grading permits, the owner/permittee shall provide a letter to the ERM verifying that a qualified biologist has been retained to implement the biological resources mitigation program as detailed below (see A through D):
  - A. The qualified biologist (project biologist) shall attend the first preconstruction meeting.
  - B. The project biologist shall supervise the placement of orange construction fencing or equivalent along the limits of disturbance within and surrounding sensitive habitats as shown on the approved *Exhibit A*.
  - C. The project biologist shall monitor construction activities as needed to ensure that construction activities do not encroach into biologically sensitive areas beyond the

limits of disturbance as shown on the approved *Exhibit A*. All construction activities (including staging areas) shall be restricted to the development area as shown on the approved *Exhibit A*.

D. The project biologist shall direct the placement of gravel bags, straw logs, silt fences or equivalent erosion control measures adjacent to all graded areas, and identify locations where trench spoil may be stockpiled in order to prevent sedimentation of the habitat. The project biologist shall oversee implementation of best management practices (BMPs) as needed to prevent any significant sediment transport.

# **Paleontological Resources**

#### PRIOR TO PRECONSTRUCTION (PRECON) MEETING

6. LAND DEVELOPMENT REVIEW (LDR) PLAN CHECK

Prior to the issuance of a Notice to Proceed (NTP) or any permits, including but not limited to, the first Grading Permit, Demolition Plans/Permits and Building Plans/Permits, the Environmental Review Manager (ERM) of LDR shall verify that the requirements for Paleontological Monitoring have been noted on the appropriate construction documents.

# 7. LETTERS OF QUALIFICATION HAVE BEEN SUBMITTED TO ERM

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

# 8. SECOND LETTER CONTAINING NAMES OF MONITORS HAS BEEN SENT TO MITIGATION MONITORING COORDINATION (MMC)

- A. At least thirty days prior to the Precon Meeting, a second letter shall be submitted to MMC which shall include the name of the Principal Investigator (PI) and the names of all persons involved in the Paleontological Monitoring of the project.
- B. MMC will provide Plan Check with a copy of both the first and second letter.

#### 9. RECORDS SEARCH PRIOR TO PRECON MEETING

At least thirty days prior to the Precon meeting, the qualified Paleontologist shall verify that a records search has been completed, and updated as necessary, and be prepared to introduce any pertinent information concerning expectations and probabilities of discovery during trenching and/or grading activities. Verification includes, but is not

limited to, a copy of a confirmation letter from the San Diego Natural History Museum, other institution, or, if the record search was in-house, a letter of verification from the PI stating that the search was completed.

#### **PRECON MEETING**

## 10. MONITOR SHALL ATTEND PRECON MEETINGS

- A. Prior to beginning of any work that requires monitoring, the Applicant shall arrange a Precon Meeting that shall include the Paleontologist, Construction Manager and/or Grading Contractor, Resident Engineer (RE), Building inspector (BI), and MMC. The qualified Paleontologist shall attend any grading related Precon Meetings to make comments and/or suggestions concerning the Paleontological Monitoring Program with the Construction Manager and/or Grading Contractor.
- B. If the Monitor is not able to attend the Precon Meeting, the RE, or BI as appropriate, will schedule a focused Precon Meeting for MMC, Monitors, Construction Manager and appropriate Contractor's representatives to meet and review the job on-site prior to start of any work that requires monitoring.

#### 11. IDENTIFY AREAS TO BE MONITORED

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

#### 12. WHEN MONITORING WILL OCCUR

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

#### **DURING CONSTRUCTION**

# 13. MONITOR SHALL BE PRESENT DURING GRADING/EXCAVATION

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

#### 14. DISCOVERIES

#### A. Minor Paleontological Discovery

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

# B. Significant Paleontological Discovery

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

## 15. NIGHT WORK

A. If night work is included in the contract

(1)

- a. When night work is included in the contract package, the extent and timing shall be presented and discussed at the precon meeting.
- b. The following procedures shall be followed:
  - No Discoveries In the event that nothing was found during the night work, The PI will record the information on the Site Visit Record Form.
  - Minor Discoveries
     All Minor Discoveries will be processed and documented using the existing procedures under During Construction with the exception that the RE will contact MMC by 9 A.M. the following morning.
  - (3) Potentially Significant Discoveries If the PI determines that a potentially significant discovery has been made, the procedures under During Construction, will be followed, with the exception that the RE will contact MMC by 8 A.M. the following morning to report and discuss the findings.
- B. If night work becomes necessary during the course of construction
  - a. The Construction Manager shall notify the RE, or BI, as appropriate, a minium of 24 hours before the work is to begin.
  - b. The RE, or BI, as appropriate, will notify MMC immediately.
- C. All other procedures described above will apply, as appropriate.

#### 16. NOTIFICATION OF COMPLETION

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

#### **POST CONSTRUCTION**

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

# 18. SUBMIT LETTER OF ACCEPTANCE FROM LOCAL QUALIFIED CURATION FACILITY

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

# 19. IF FOSSIL COLLECTION IS NOT ACCEPTED, CONTACT LDR FOR ALTERNATIVES

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

# 20. RECORDING SITES WITH SAN DIEGO NATURAL HISTORY MUSEUM

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

# 21. FINAL RESULTS REPORT

- A. Prior to the release of the grading bond, two copies of the Final Results Report (even if negative), which describes the results, analysis, and conclusions of the above Paleontological Monitoring Program (with appropriate graphics) shall be submitted to MMC for approval by the ERM of LDR.
- B. MMC shall notify the RE or BI, as appropriate, of receipt of the Final Results Report.

# Hydrology/Water Quality

# **PRE-CONSTRUCTION**

- 22. Prior to the issuance of any building permits, the applicant shall obtain a bonded grading permit from the City Engineer (referred to as an "engineering permit" for the grading proposed for this project. All grading shall conform to the requirements in accordance with the City of San Diego Municipal Code in a manner satisfactory to the City Engineer.
- 28. Prior to the issuance of any construction permit, the Environmental Review Manger (ERM) of Land Development Review Division (LDR), shall verify that the owner/permittee/subdivider has incorporated any construction Best Management

Practices necessary to comply with Chapter 14, Article 2, Division 1 (Grading Regulations) of the Municipal Code, in the construction plan or specifications, satisfactory to the City Engineer.

29. Development of this project shall comply with all the requirements of the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) Order No. 99-08 and the Municipal Storm Water Permit, Order No. 2001-01, Waste Discharge Requirements for Discharges of Storm Water Runoff Associated With Construction Activity.

In accordance with said permit, a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and a Monitoring Program Plan shall be developed and implemented concurrently with the commencement of grading activities. The SWPPP shall identify all applicable erosion control devices to be used during construction. These may include (but may not be limited to) earthen berms, gravel bags, silt fences, temporary storm drains, desilting basins, energy dissipating devices, bladed swales, geotextile mats, plastic sheeting, and hyrdoseeding or other vegetation and irrigation practices.

- 30. In addition, the owner(s) and the subsequent owner(s) of any portion of the property covered by this grading permit and by SWRCB Order NO. 99-08-DWQ, and any subsequent amendment thereto, shall comply with special provisions set forth in Section C.7 of SWRCB Order No. 99-08-DWQ.
- 31. A complete and accurate Notice of Intent (NOI) shall be filed with the SWRCB. A copy of the acknowledgment from the SWRCB that an NOI has been received for this project shall be filed with the City of San Diego when received; furthermore, a copy of the completed NOI from the SWRCB showing the permit number for this project shall be filed with the City of San Diego when received.
- 32. The owner/permittee shall note the following on the construction plans: "The applicant and/or contractor shall post the City/State approved SWPPP on the job site during all construction activities."

# **POST-CONSTRUCTION**

- 33. Prior to the issuance of any construction permit, the owner/permittee/subdivider shall incorporate and show the type and location of all post-construction Best Management Practices (BMPs) on the final construction drawings, consistent with the registered civil engineering stamped Water Quality Technical Report, approved by the City Engineer.
- 34. Prior to the issuance of any construction permit, the Environmental Review Manager (ERM) of the Land Development Review (LDR) shall verify that these comprehensive permanent post-construction Best Management Practices (BMPs) have been incorporated into the construction plans to reduce the amount of pollutants and sediments discharged from the project site into the City's storm drain system. BMPs may include but are not limited to catch basins fitted with oil/sediment filters to filter runoff from the development prior to the discharge into the storm drain system.

35. Prior to the issuance of any construction permit, the owner/permittee/subdivider shall enter into a Maintenance Agreement for the ongoing permanent BMP maintenance, satisfactory to the City Engineer.

The maintenance agreement shall be prepared satisfactory to the City Engineer and shall define the owner/permittee/subdivider as the responsible party for the permanent maintenance of the hydrology/water quality controls. As part of the permanent maintenance agreement, any oil/sediment filters and/or proposed clean-outs (grease, oil, and heavy metal particulate traps) which are installed on-site shall be cleaned and maintained by the owner/permittee/subdivider as necessary, to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. Equivalent alternative available technologies and BMPs may be approved by the City Engineer.

- 36. Prior to the issuance of Certificates of Occupancy, the City Engineer shall inspect the permanent post-construction hydrology and/or water quality controls to ensure the system functions properly. Equivalent alternative available technologies and BMPs may be required by the City Engineer based on the field inspection.
- 37. The drainage system proposed with this development shall be subject to approval by the City Engineer.
- VI. PUBLIC REVIEW DISTRIBUTION:

Draft copies or notice of this Mitigated Negative Declaration were distributed to: City of San Diego Council Member Peters, District 1 Development Services Department (78, 78A) Planning Department, MSCP Library (81) Other Entities/Organizations U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service (23) California Department of Fish & Game (32) California Regional Water Quality Control Board (44) Sierra Club (165/165A) Audubon Society (167) California Native Plant Society (170) Center for Biological Diversity (176) Endangered Habitats League (182) Historical Resources Board (87) Jerry Schaefer, Ph.D. (208A) South Coastal Information Center @ San Diego State University (210) San Diego Archaeological Center (212) Save Our Heritage Organisation (214) Ron Christman (215) Louie Guassac (215A) San Diego County Archaeological Society (218) Kumeyaay Cultural Repatriation Committee (225)

Barona Group of Capitan Grande Band of Mission Indians (225A) Campo Band of Mission Indians (225B) Cuyapaipe Band of Mission Indians (225C) Inaja and Cosmit Band of Mission Indians (225D) Jamul Indian Village (225E) La Posta Band of Mission Indians (225F) Manzanita Band of Mission Indians (225G) Sycuan Band of Mission Indians (225H) Viejas Group of Capitan Grande Band of Mission Indians (225I) Mesa Grande Band of Mission Indians (225J) San Pasqual Band of Mission Indians (225K) Santa Ysabel Band of Diegueño Indians (225L) La Jolla Band of Mission Indians (225M) Pala Band of Mission Indians (225N) Pauma Band of Mission Indians (2250) Pechanga Band of Mission Indians (225P) San Luiseno Band of Mission Indians/Rincon (225Q) Los Coyotes Band of Indians (225R) Rancho Peñasquitos Community Council (378) Rancho Peñasquitos Planning Board (380) Rancho Peñasquitos Town Council (383)

# VII. RESULTS OF PUBLIC REVIEW:

- ( ) No comments were received during the public input period.
- () Comments were received but did not address the draft Mitigated Negative Declaration finding or the accuracy/completeness of the Initial Study. No response is necessary. The letters are attached.
- (X) Comments addressing the findings of the draft Mitigated Negative Declaration and/or accuracy or completeness of the Initial Study were received during the public input period. The letters and responses follow.

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

Terri Bumgardner, Senior Planner Development Services Department October 17, 2003 Date of Draft Report

November 19, 2003

Date of Final

Analyst: JARQUE



San Diego County Archaeological Society, Inc.

Environmental Review Committee 27 October 2003

Ms. Anne Jarque Land Development Review Division Planning and Development Review Department City of San Diego 1222 First Avenue, Mail Station 501 San Diego, California 92101

Subject: Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration Almazon Residences Project. No. 6107

#### Dear Ms. Jarque:

500

SPH DIECO COUN,

To:

AR CT PEOLOGICAL

1.

I have reviewed the subject PMND on behalf of this committee of the San Diego County Archaeological Society.

Based on the information contained in the PMND and initial study, and the letter report from Affinis, we note that the PMND omits the Affinis recommendation that the small archaeological collection from the testing program be curated. Given the size of the collection, the cost of complying with this recommendation will likely on the order of \$50 per lot. This recommendation should be noted in the PMND and implemented by the applicant.

Thank you for providing this project's environmental documents to us for our review and comment.

					Sincerely, James D. James W. Royle, J Environmental Re	V Ir., Chairper view Comr	son nittee
Affinis SDCAS	President						
	8.8	3	8	8	The second		ti angle
	Affinis SDCAS	Affinis SDCAS President	Affinis SDCAS President	Affinis SDCAS President	Affinis SDCAS President	Affinis SDCAS President	Affinis SDCAS President

Comment noted. The letter has been forwarded to the applicant. The archeological survey submitted concluded the site and its resources to be identified as not significant under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and therefore no mitigation, such as a requirement to curate the collection, would be required. However, the applicant should coordinate with the consulting archaeologist to find a local curation facility, as recommended.

1.

City of San Diego Development Services Department LAND DEVELOPMENT REVIEW DIVISION 1222 First Avenue, Mail Station 501 San Diego, CA 92101 (619) 446-6460

> INITIAL STUDY Project No. 6107 SCH No. (Pending)

SUBJECT: <u>Almazon Residences</u>. SITE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT (SDP No. 10179) to grade seven (7) contiguous undeveloped lots and construct seven (7) individual single-family residences. The entire 4.51-acres project site is comprised of seven legal lots (Lots 205 through 211 of the Peñasquitos Glens Subdivision) and is located along the north side of Almazon Street, between Andorra Way and Paymogo Street, within the Rancho Peñasquitos Community Planning Area. Applicant: James Freitas.

# I. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed project and Site Development Permit (SDP No. 10179), to be considered by Hearing Officer (Process 3), would allow the development of seven single-family residences on seven individual legal lots. Table 1 below illustrates the development area of each lot. The proposed project would include three types of floor plans and five types of exterior building plans that would meet the City's development regulations.

Lot Number	Plan Type	Lot Area* (acres)	Lot Area* (square feet)	Proposed Living Area (square feet)	Proposed Garage Area (square feet)	TOTAL SQUARE FOOTAGE
205	ЗА	0.66	28,750	1,987	450	2,437 .
206	1A	0.77	33,541	1,852	445	2,297
207	2B	0.65	28,314	2,125	420	2,545
208	ЗA	0.59	25,700	1,987	450	2,437
209	2A	0.66	28,750	2,125	420	2,545
210	1B	0.56	24,394	1,852	445	2,297
211	1A	0.61	26,572	1,852	445	2,297
TOTAL		4.51 ±	196,021 ±	13,780	3,075	16,855

# Table 1 Development Summary

\* Conversions of lot area have been rounded and are approximate.

Proposed Floor Plan 1 would be two stories with a total living area of 1,852 square feet; Floor Plan 2 would be two stories with total living area of 2,125 square feet; and Floor Plan 3 would be two stories with a total living area of 1,987 square feet.

Access to each of the properties would be from proposed driveways along Almazon Street. Each residence would include an attached two-car garage and would meet parking requirements for the underlying zone.

Approximately 1.04-acre (42,000 square feet) of the entire 4.51-acres (196,021 $\pm$  square feet) would require site grading to create seven level pad areas for development. Grading would include approximately 6,878 cubic yards of soil cut at a maximum depth of 14 feet and 701 cubic yards of soil fill with a maximum height of fill slope of six feet. The remaining 6,177 cubic yards of soil material would be exported to a legal disposal site as required as an engineering condition of the permit. Six retaining walls (one retaining wall on six of the seven properties) would be constructed. The maximum length of a proposed retaining wall would be 13 feet. (Figure 2)

Proposed landscaping would include trees such as Golden Medallion (*Cassia leptophulla*), Brisbane box (*Tristania conferta*), and Cork Oak (*Quercus suber*); shrubs such as Toyon (*Heteromeles arbutifolia*), India Hawthorne (*Rhaplolepis indica*), and Mexican Sage (*Salvia leucantha*); and groundcover/hydroseed mix of Myoporum (*Myoporum parvifolium*), Dwarf Coyote Bush (*Baccharis pilularis*), and California Poppy (*Eschscholzia californica*). An open space easement would be placed on the remainder portion (approximately  $3.47 \pm acres$ ) of the property that contains existing coastal sage scrub habitat. The project is not located in or adjacent to the City's Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA).

**II. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING:** 

The seven parcels (Lots 205 through 211 of the Peñasquitos Glens Subdivision) are located on the north side of Almazon Street, between Paymogo Street and Andorra Way, in the Rancho Peñasquitos community. (Figure 1) The site is zoned RS-1-14 (Residential) and designated as low density residential (1-5 dwelling unit/per acre), as identified in the Rancho Peñasquitos Community Plan. The surrounding area includes the same single-family residential development and is also zoned residential (RS-1-14).

The seven individual lots are rectangular in shape, consisting primarily of a steep, southsouthwesterly facing slope. Approximately 0.78 acres of the southern portion of the project site adjacent to Almazon Street had been previously cleared and grubbed for brush management (fire hazard/public safety) purposes and was required for the previous permit and subdivision development. This portion of the property, where development would occur, primarily contains bare ground and ruderal vegetation. The remaining 3.72 acres along the steep sleep (greater than 25%) primarily contains undisturbed native sensitive coastal sage scrub habitat. A previous Hillside Review permit (HR No. 89-0969) and Resource Protection Ordinance permit (RPO No. 89-0969) was filed on the property for a proposed development of nine (9) single-family residences on nine (9) contiguous lots. However, the previous applicant did not develop the lots, the permit has expired, and the current proposed project would allow development of only seven of the previous nine lots.

#### III. ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS:

See attached Initial Study checklist.

#### IV. DISCUSSION:

The following environmental issues were considered during the initial study and determined to be significant, but could be mitigated to a level below significance. Mitigation will be required as described in Section V (Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Program) of the attached Mitigated Negative Declaration.

#### **Biological Resources**

Preliminary research and a site visit conducted by staff identified sensitive biological resources on and adjacent to the property. According the City's Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) maps (1995), the Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA) is not located within or adjacent to the property although sensitive biological resources exist onsite. In addition, previous history of an open space easement located on the steep northern portion of the seven properties may have been recorded when the 4.5-acres site was subdivided.

Therefore, to determine the project's potential to significantly impact biological resources, the applicant was required to submit a biological report which would quantify in acreage any impacts to biological resources, qualify the habitat type according to the City's Biological Resources Guidelines (July 2002), and provide any recommendations that would mitigate potentially significant impacts to a level below significance.

A Biological Resources Survey for the Almazon Street Property (Affinis, April 2003) was submitted to disclose the direct, indirect, and/or cumulative biological impacts from the proposed project. The report, which is available for public review at the offices of the Land Development Review Division, identified approximately 3.73 acres of coastal sage scrub (Tier II) consisting primarily of California sagebrush (*Artemisia californica*) and black sage (*Salvia mellifera*) to be located on the northern portions of the seven individual parcels. Approximately 0.78 acre of disturbed habitat that had been previously cleared and grubbed for brush management and supporting a few weedy species such as filaree (*Erodium* sp.) and black mustard (*Brassica* sp.) is located along the southern portion of the project site along Almazon Street.

The report concluded that 0.52-acre of disturbed habitat (Tier IV) and 0.60 acre of coastal sage scrub habitat (Tier II) would be directly impacted from the proposed development and

brush management Zone-1 impacts. Approximately 0.08 acre of disturbed habitat and 0.65 acre of coastal sage scrub habitat would be impacted in brush management Zone-2 which is considered impact neutral, and no mitigation would be required. In addition, in accordance with the City's Biological Resource Guidelines, lands qualified as Tier IV (disturbed/ ornamental/ruderal) would not be considered to have a significant habitat value and impacts would not require mitigation, either. However, impacts totaling more than 0.1-acre of upland (Tiers I-III) habitat would be considered significant and mitigation would be required at the appropriate mitigation ratios.

Therefore, any potentially significant direct impacts to biological resources would require biological monitoring during grading and construction. In addition, the applicant would be required to purchase 0.60 acre of off-site upland habitat (Tiers I - III) within the City of San Diego Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA) for impacts to 0.60 acre of coastal sage scrub (Tier II) habitat impacted by the proposed development - or - pay into the City's Habitat Acquisition Fund the amount necessary to purchase 0.60 acre at a 1:1 mitigation ratio. These conditions are outlined and described in the attached MND (Section V, Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting, Program) and implementation would mitigate potential biology impacts to a level below significance.

#### Water Ouality

Water quality is affected by sedimentation caused by erosion, runoff carrying contaminants, and direct discharge of pollutants (point-source pollution). Proposed development creating new impervious surfaces could send an increased volume of runoff containing oils, heavy metals, pesticides, fertilizers, and other contaminants (non-point-source pollution) into the stormwater drainage system if not controlled.

Based on the project site area and grading plans submitted, the project may result in potentially significant impacts to water quality primarily from 1) oils and grease from the driveways, 2) sediments, fertilizers, and pesticides from landscaped areas, and 3) sediment and soil erosion during construction grading.

Therefore, to determine the project's storm water Best Management Practices (BMPs) to control pollution run-off that may result in a significant downstream water quality impact, the applicant was required to submit a Storm Water Requirements Applicability Checklist to determine the appropriate water quality technical report for the project.

A Water Quality Technical Report (K&S Engineering, April 2003) was prepared in conformance with the City's Storm Water Standards and submitted for review. The report and checklist can be reviewed at the offices of the Land Development Review Division. The report identified the potential pollutant sources from the development and recommended appropriate construction and post-construction BMPs to mitigate potential impacts to a level below significance. Proposed permanent treatment control BMPs include specific site design to minimize newly created impervious surfaces and to maximize use of landscaped, grassy filter strips, and maintenance of on-site biofilters. During construction grading, temporary source control BMPs include the use of gravel-bag berms, silt fences, and other erosion control measures.

Therefore, the applicant must comply with the mitigation measures (implementation of construction and post-construction BMPs) that are described in Section V (Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Program) of the Mitigated Negative Declaration to minimize and control runoff carrying pollutants that could create potentially significant impacts to downstream water bodies.

# Paleontology

According to the Geology of San Diego Metropolitan Area, California (1975), published by the California Division of Mines and Geology, the project is underlain by Santiago Peak Volcanic Formation. This geologic formation has produced petrified wood and important remains of siliceous microfossils and marine macro-invertebrates (Deméré, August 1994). This formation is assigned a moderate paleontological resource sensitivity rating and impacts would be considered significant if a project proposes more than 2,000 cubic yards of soil cut at a maximum depth of 10 feet or more. In addition, the *Updated Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation* (Petra, December 20, 2002) identified Santiago Peak Formation at a depth of 5 feet to 30 feet below ground surface.

The project's proposed grading could therefore result in significant impacts to buried fossil resources within the Santiago Peak Formation. The applicant has agreed to implement the paleontological Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Program (MMRP) during site grading, as described in Section V of the attached MND to mitigate impacts to a level below significance.

The following environmental issues were considered during the initial study and determined to be below a level of significance, therefore no mitigation would be required.

Cultural Resources (Pre-historic)

Based on preliminary research conducted by staff, the project site is located in a highly sensitive cultural resource area. In addition, during the previous HR/RPO No. 89-0969 permit approval, an archaeological testing program was conducted and an archeological site (CA-SDI-11,473) has been recorded within the project boundaries. Therefore, to determine if the proposed project would significantly impact any previously identified archaeological survey, *Almazon Homes/Peñasquitos Glens Property* (Affinis, November 1989).

A subsequent letter report, *Almazon Residences (Project No. 6107) - Archaeology* (Affinis, June 2003), confirmed, as concluded in the previous report, that the proposed development would not have a significant effect on impacting cultural resources. Both reports are available for public review at the offices of the Land Development Review Division. The archaeological testing program, conducted in 1989, collected thirty-five artifacts for further study and CA-SDI-11,473 was recorded within the project site boundaries. The report concluded that the archeological site had an extremely limited research potential, would not be considered significant, and no further mitigation would be required.

Therefore, staff determined, based on the previous surveys submitted and testing program conducted, the proposed development would not likely discover or impact significant archaeological resources or the recorded site that was determined to be not significant, and no mitigation would be required.

#### Geology and Soils

The project site is located in a seismically active region of California, and therefore, the potential exists for geologic hazards, such as earthquakes and ground failure. The project site is located in an area that is mapped with a Geologic Hazard Ratings of 53 (Level or sloping terrain, unfavorable geologic structure, low to moderate risk).

An Updated Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation (Petra, December 20, 2002) and Addendum to Updated Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation - Response to the City of San Diego Review Memorandum (Petra, April 28, 2003) for the subject property was submitted for review. The reports are available for public review at the offices of the Land Development Review Division. The consultant concluded that remedial grading would be required to prepare the site for the proposed development and that no significant geologic or soils conditions have been identified to preclude development or require further mitigation. In addition, the slope stability analysis concluded that proposed 1.5:1 cut slope(s) would have a factor of safety of 2.70, and no mitigation would be required.

Therefore based on the submitted technical reports, any potentially significant impacts to the existing soil and geologic conditions would not be anticipated with the proposed project, and no mitigation would be required.

# V. RECOMMENDATION:

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

Although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described in Section IV above have been added to the project. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION should be prepared.

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

Attachments:

X

Location Map (Figure 1) Site Plan (Figure 2) Initial Study Checklist



CITY OF SAN DIEGO • DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT



EXIST WATER LATERAL

EXIST FH

EXIST ST. LICHT

Figure 2

JN02-110

Original Date: 02-27-03

XX

2

Sheet \_\_\_\_\_ of \_\_\_

DEP .

heet Title: -\_\_\_\_\_ Conceptual Grading Plan

0

Site/Grading

Almazon Residences



Contraction (Contraction (Contraction)

Initial StudyChecklistDate:October 7, 2003Project No.:6107Project:Almazon Residences

Mavbe

Yes

No

#### III. ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS:

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

**AESTHETICS / NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER** A. Will the proposal result in: 1. The obstruction of any vista or scenic view from a public viewing area? V The proposed structures would not block any identified views and would meet the required setbacks and height limits for the underlying zone. 2. The creation of a negative aesthetic site or project?

The proposed structures would be visually compatible with the surrounding single-family residences.

3. Project bulk, scale, materials, or style which would be incompatible with surrounding development? See A.2.

4. Substantial alteration to the existing character of the area? *See A-2.* 

5. The loss of any distinctive or landmark tree(s), or a stand of mature trees? *No such resources exist on-site.* 

Mavbe Yes No

In the letter

6. Substantial change in topography or ground surface relief features? Construction grading (6,878 cubic yards of soil cut and 701 cubic yards of soil fill) would not likely substantially change the site's topography or ground surface relief features. Development would occur within approximately 1.04-acres of the4.51-acres site.

7. The loss, covering or modification of any unique geologic or physical features such as a natural canyon, sandstone bluff, rock outcrop, or hillside with a slope in excess of 25 percent?

No such resources would be affected by proposed development.

- 8. Substantial light or glare? Minimal lighting and exterior building treatments would not produce a substantial amount of light or glare.
- 9. Substantial shading of other properties? The proposed structure meets required setbacks and height limits and would not substantially shade adjacent properties.

# **B.** AGRICULTURE RESOURCES / NATURAL RESOURCES / MINERAL RESOURCES Would the proposal result in:

- 1. The loss of availability of a known mineral resource (e.g., sand or gravel) that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? *No such resources exist on-site.*
- 2. The conversion of agricultural land to nonagricultural use or impairment of the agricultural productivity of agricultural land? See B.1.

C. AIR QUALITY Would the proposal:

		<u>Yes</u> <u>Ma</u>	ybe	No
	family reaching the Cipis			
1.	Conflict with or obstruct implementation			
	of the applicable air quality plan?	10122.00		V
	Single-family residences would not likely			
	conflict with any air quality plans or standards.			
2.	Violate any air quality standard or contribute			
	substantially to an existing or projected	ulit he received on th		
	air quality violation?	Recontai <del>n c</del> osstal sag	the second s	~
	See C.1.			
3.	Expose sensitive receptors to			
	substantial pollutant concentrations?	transis - data are a	-0	V
	See C.1. Project would not generate air			
	pollutants.			
4.	Create objectionable odors affecting a			
Sec. 12	substantial number of people?	Carentaria (11)	The vir	V
	Single-family residences only would not likely			
	create objectionable odors.			
5.	Exceed 100 pounds per day of			
	Particulate Matter 10 (dust)?	having a the set will be	- with	V
	Project construction may temporarily create			
	particulate matter (dust) but would not			
	significantly exceed threshold.			
6.	Alter air movement in the area of the project?	start onikation's sheet		V
	Single-family residences would not likely alter			
	the air movement.			
7.	Cause a substantial alteration in moisture,			
	or temperature, or any change in			
	climate, either locally or regionally?	Solution and the solution	-	V
	Proposed development would not affect or			
	change the climate.			
	Consin automation			
BI	OLOGY			
Wo	ould the proposal result in:			
1.	A reduction in the number of any unique,			
	rare, endangered, sensitive, or fully			
	protected species of plants or animals?		V	
	The project would impact approximately 0.60-	100	VIO?	NI NI
	acre of coastal sage scrub habitat. The project			
	would provide off-site mitigation at a 1:1 ratio			

V

V

for any direct impacts to sensitive biological habitats by purchasing lands within the City's MHPA. See Initial Study Biological Resources discussion.

- 2. A substantial change in the diversity of any species of animals or plants? See D.1. An open space conservation easement would be recorded on the remaining 3.47-acres that contain coastal sage scrub habitat.
- Introduction of invasive species of plants into the area? No invasive plants are proposed.
- 4. Interference with the movement of any resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors? *See D.1.*
- 5. An impact to a sensitive habitat, including, but not limited to streamside vegetation, aquatic, riparian, oak woodland, coastal sage scrub or chaparral? See D.1.
- 6. An impact on City, State, or federally regulated wetlands (including, but not limited to, coastal salt marsh, vernal pool, lagoon, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption or other means? No such resources have been identified on-site.

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

# E. ENERGY

Would the proposal:

es Mayte

1. Result in the use of excessive amounts of fuel or energy (e.g. natural gas)? Single-family residential uses only. Yes

Maybe

DIRCL OF SHE

No

V

V

V

V

recluding ber not limited to

2. Result in the use of excessive amounts of power? *See E.1.* 

# F. GEOLOGY/SOILS

Would the proposal:

- Expose people or property to geologic hazards such as earthquakes, landslides, mudslides, ground failure, or similar hazards? The property is mapped with a Geological Hazard Rating of 53 (Level or sloping terrain, unfavorable geologic structure, low to moderate risk). See Initial Study Geology/Soils discussion.
- 2. Result in a substantial increase in wind or water erosion of soils, either on or off the site? *Minimal grading proposed and site drainage* would not substantially increase wind or water erosion of soils. Temporary and permanent Best Management Practices (BMPs) would be implemented.
- 3. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse? See F-1.

# G. HISTORICAL RESOURCES

Would the proposal result in:

1. Alteration of or the destruction of a prehistoric or historic archaeological site?

Archeological site (CA-SDI-11,473) has been recorded within the project boundaries, but previous survey and testing program did not identify the site or its resources as significant. An subsequent updated archaeological letter survey confirmed that the proposed project

tars IVEC to white

to files to zero

V

V

V

would not likely impact any potentially significant cultural resources. See Initial Study Historical Resources (Cultural) discussion.

- 2. Adverse physical or aesthetic effects to a prehistoric or historic building, structure, object, or site? *See G.1.*
- 3. Adverse physical or aesthetic effects to an architecturally significant building, structure, or object? See G.1.
- Any impact to existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area? No such uses exist on-site.
- 5. The disturbance of any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? *See G.1.*

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

- 1. Create any known health hazard (excluding mental health)? Single-family residences would not likely produce or create human health/public safety/hazardous materials impacts.
- 2. Expose people or the environment to a significant hazard through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials? *See H.1.*
- 3. Create a future risk of an explosion or the release of hazardous substances (including but not limited to gas, oil, pesticides, chemicals, radiation, or explosives)? *See H.1.*

4. Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? *See H.1.*  No

V

Yes

Maybe

with any such

5. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, create a significant hazard to the public or environment? *The project site is not identified on such a list mentioned above.* 

6. 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? The applicant would be required to implement a Brush Management Program to reduce potential fire, erosion, and slope failure hazards which may occur on-site.

HYDROLOGY/WATER QUALITY Would the proposal result in:

I.

1. An increase in pollutant discharges, including down stream sedimentation, to receiving waters during or following construction? Consider water quality parameters such as temperature dissolved oxygen, turbidity and other typical storm water pollutants. Due to the existing site conditions and drainage patterns, the applicant would be required to implement construction and post-construction Best Management Practices (BMPs) that would control potential downstream water quality impacts. See Initial Study Water Quality discussion.

2. An increase in impervious surfaces and associated increased runoff? *See I.1.* 

3. Substantial alteration to on- and off-site drainage patterns due to changes in runoff

V

V

V

V

V

flow rates or volumes? *See I.1.* 

- Discharge of identified pollutants to an already impaired water body (as listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303(b) list)? See I.1.
- 5. A potentially significant adverse impact on ground water quality? *See I.1.*
- 6. Cause or contribute to exceeding applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses? *See I.1.*

# J. LAND USE Would the proposal result in:

- 1. A land use which is inconsistent with the adopted community plan land use designation for the site or conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over a project? The proposed single-family residence would be in conformance with the Rancho Peñasquitos Community Plan residential land use designation for the site.
- 2. A conflict with the goals, objectives and recommendations of the community plan in which it is located? *See J.1.*
- 3. A conflict with adopted environmental plans, including applicable habitat conservation plans adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect for the area? *See D.7. The project would not be in conflict with any such plans.*
- 4. Physically divide an established community? *See J.1.*

5. Land uses which are not compatible with aircraft accident potential as defined by an adopted airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP)? The site is not identified in or affected by any identified zones within a CLUP. Maybe

10 V3 (265)

Yes

No

V

V

# K. NOISE

Would the proposal result in:

- 1. A significant increase in the existing ambient noise levels? Seven single-family residences would not likely increase ambient noise levels.
- Exposure of people to noise levels which exceed the City's adopted noise ordinance?
   See K-1.
- 3. Exposure of people to current or future transportation noise levels which exceed standards established in the Transportation Element of the General Plan or an adopted airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan? *See K-1.*

# L. PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the proposal impact a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? The project is underlain with Santiago Peak Volcanic Formation (Moderate sensitivity rating). Project grading and construction could potentially impact identified Santiago Peak Volcanic Formation that could yield significant paleontological resources. See Paleontological Resources Initial Study discussion.

- M. **POPULATION AND HOUSING** *Would the proposal:* 
  - 1. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by

V

proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? Seven single-family residences would not likely induce substantial population growth to the area.

- 2. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? *See M.1.*
- 3. Alter the planned location, distribution, density or growth rate of the population of an area? *See M.1.*

# N. PUBLIC SERVICES

Would the proposal have an effect upon, or result in a need for new or altered governmental services in any of the following areas:

t Comprehensive Lund

est is and share with Santiaro Pea

anon natives ald vield summered

- 1. Fire protection? Services in the area are adequate for the proposed development.
- 2. Police protection? See N.1.
- 3. Schools? See N.1.
- 4. Parks or other recreational facilities? *See N.1.*
- 5. Maintenance of public facilities, including roads? *See N.1.*
- 6. Other governmental services? *See N.1.*
- **O. RECREATIONAL RESOURCES** *Would the proposal result in:* 
  - 1. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks

or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? *The project would not be required to provide additional parks for the community.*  Maybe

Yes

No

V

V

V

Namal das

2. 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?

# P. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION Would the proposal result in:

- Traffic generation in excess of specific/ community plan allocation? No substantial increase in traffic generation is expected from the proposed development.
- 2. An increase in projected traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system? *See P.1.*
- 3. An increased demand for off-site parking? No substantial increase would be expected. The project would provide 2 parking spaces (per lot development) in a proposed 2-car garage, when 2 are required.
- 4. Effects on existing parking? *See P.3.*
- 5. Substantial impact upon existing or planned transportation systems? *See P.3.*
- 6. Alterations to present circulation movements including effects on existing public access to beaches, parks, or other open space areas?
  See P.1.

V

V

V

V

V

V

V

V

V

- 7. Increase in traffic hazards for motor vehicles, bicyclists or pedestrians due to a proposed, non-standard design feature (e.g., poor sight distance or driveway onto an access-restricted roadway)? See P.1.
- 8. A conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation models (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? *The development would be in conformance with above-mentioned policies, plans, or programs.*

# Q. UTILITIES

Would the proposal result in a need for new systems, or require substantial alterations to existing utilities, including:

1. Natural gas?

The project would develop seven new singlefamily residences. Services are adequate for the proposed development.

capacity of the street system

201 1100 201 2

ionet upon existing

demand for off-site and the

- 2. Communications systems? *See Q.1.*
- 3. Water? See Q.1.
- 4. Sewer? See Q.1.
- 5. Storm water drainage? *See Q.1.*
- 6. Solid waste disposal? *See Q.1.*
- **R.** WATER CONSERVATION Would the proposal result in:
  - 1. Use of excessive amounts of water? The project would develop seven new singlefamily residences. Services are adequate for the proposed development.

INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

 Landscaping which is predominantly non-drought resistant vegetation?
 The project would comply with City's Landscape Standards.

# S. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:

- 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? *No substantial change.*
- Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals? (A short-term impact on the environment is one which occurs in a relatively brief, definitive period of time while long-term impacts would endure well into the future.)

No such impacts have been identified.

 Does the project have impacts which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (A project may impact on two or more separate resources where the impact on each resource is relatively small, but where the effect of the total of those impacts on the environment is significant.) No such cumulative impacts have been identified.

 Does the project have environmental effects which would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? No such impacts have been identified.

V

# INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

# REFERENCES

<b>A</b> .	Aesthetics / Neighborhood Character
<u></u>	City of San Diego Progress Guide and General Plan.
~	Community Plan.
~	Local Coastal Plan.
B.	Agricultural Resources / Natural Resources / Mineral Resources
~	City of San Diego Progress Guide and General Plan.
~	U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Survey - San Diego Area, California, Part I and II, 1973.
	California Department of Conservation - Division of Mines and Geology, Mineral Land Classification.
<u></u>	Division of Mines and Geology, Special Report 153 - Significant Resources Maps.
C.	Air
<u>ba</u>	California Clean Air Act Guidelines (Indirect Source Control Programs) 1990.
~	Regional Air Quality Strategies (RAQS) - APCD.
D.	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.
<u>-100</u>	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.
V	City of San Diego Land Development Code Biology Guidelines.
<u> </u>	Site Specific Report: A <i>Biological Resources Survey for the Almazon Street Property</i> (Affinis, April 2003).
E.	Energy (N/A).
	L. Hydrology/Water Quality
F.	Geology/Soils
V	City of San Diego Seismic Safety Study.
<u> </u>	U.S. Department of Agriculture Soil Survey - San Diego Area, California, Part I and II, December 1973 and Part III, 1975.
<u>/</u>	Site Specific Report: 1) An Updated Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation (Petra, December 20, 2002) and 2) Addendum to Updated Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation - Response to the City of San Diego Review Memorandum (Petra, April 28, 2003).
G.	Historical Resources
<u> </u>	City of San Diego Historical Resources Guidelines.
~	City of San Diego Archaeology Library.
	City of San Diego Historical Inventory of Historical Architects, Structures, and People in San Diego (July 2000)
	Historical Resources Board List.
	Community Historical Survey:
<u> </u>	Site Specific Report: 1) Almazon Homes/Peñasquitos Glens Property (Affinis, November 1989) and 2) Almazon Residences (Project No. 6107) - Archaeology (Affinis, June 2003).
H.	Human Health / Public Safety / Hazardous Materials
V	San Diego County Hazardous Materials Environmental Assessment Listing, 1996.

- San Diego County Hazardous Materials Management Division
- \_\_\_\_ FAA Determination
- \_\_\_\_ State Assessment and Mitigation, Unauthorized Release Listing, Public Use Authorized 1995.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan.
- ✓ City of San Diego Landscape Standards.

# I. Hydrology/Water Quality

- ✓ Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM).
- ✓ Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), National Flood Insurance Program -Flood Boundary and Floodway Map.
- ✓ Clean Water Act Section 303(b) list, dated May 19, 1999, http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/tmdl/303d\_lists.html).
- ✓ City of San Diego Storm Water Standards.
- J. Land Use
- ✓ City of San Diego Progress Guide and General Plan.
- ∠ Community Plan.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan
- ✓ City of San Diego Zoning Maps
- \_\_\_\_\_ FAA Determination
- ✓ City of San Diego, Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP), Subarea Plan, 1997
- K. Noise
- Community Plan
- San Diego International Airport Lindbergh Field CNEL Maps.
- Brown Field Airport Master Plan CNEL Maps.

- Marine Corps Air Station (MCAS) Miramar CNEL Maps.
- San Diego Association of Governments San Diego Regional Average Weekday Traffic Volumes.
- \_\_\_\_ San Diego Metropolitan Area Average Weekday Traffic Volume Maps, SANDAG.
- City of San Diego Progress Guide and General Plan.

# L. Paleontological Resources

- ✓ City of San Diego Paleontological Guidelines.
- ✓ Thomas A., and Stephen L. Walsh, "Paleontological Resources City of San Diego," Department of Paleontology San Diego Natural History Museum, 1996.
- ✓ Kennedy, Michael P., and Gary L. Peterson, "Geology of the San Diego Metropolitan Area, California. Del Mar, La Jolla, Point Loma, La Mesa, Poway, and SW 1/4 Escondido 7 ½ Minute Quadrangles," <u>California Division of Mines and Geology Bulletin</u> 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: 1) An Updated Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation (Petra, December 20, 2002) and 2) Addendum to Updated Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation - Response to the City of San Diego Review Memorandum (Petra, April 28, 2003).

# M. Population / Housing

- \_\_\_\_ City of San Diego Progress Guide and General Plan.
- Community Plan.
- \_\_\_\_ Series 8 Population Forecasts, SANDAG.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Other: \_\_\_\_\_
- N. Public Services (N/A)
- City of San Diego Progress Guide and General Plan.
  - Community Plan.
- **O.** Recreational Resources

- ✓ City of San Diego Progress Guide and General Plan.
- ∠ Community Plan.
- ✓ Department of Park and Recreation
- \_\_\_\_ City of San Diego San Diego Regional Bicycling Map
- P. Transportation / Circulation
- ✓ City of San Diego Progress Guide and General Plan.
- ✓ Community Plan.
- \_\_\_\_\_ San Diego Metropolitan Area Average Weekday Traffic Volume Maps, SANDAG.
- \_\_\_\_\_ San Diego Region Weekday Traffic Volumes, SANDAG.
- Caltrans Project Report (1989)
- Q. Utilities (N/A)

# R. Water Conservation

- ✓ City of San Diego Landscape Standards, December 1997.
  - \_\_\_\_ Sunset Magazine, <u>New Western Garden Book</u>. Rev. ed. Menlo Park, CA: Sunset Magazine.

any of San Diego Progress Conde and Contral Plant

Company Plan

Sones 8 Population Forecusts, SANDAG

Public Solution (N/A)

City of San Diego Progress Guide and General Plan

Connormey Phase

Recreational Reantrees