NEGATIVE DECLARATION

THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO

Project No. 509894
SCH No. N/A

SUBJECT: Truax: A TENTATIVE MAP and SITE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT for the subdivision of one existing parcel into three parcels. The project site contains two existing single-family residences that would remain. No structures would be constructed. Private improvements within the right-of-way to access existing parcels and to provide a hammerhead turn-around for vehicles are proposed, including a retaining wall; curb; curb and gutter; pavement driveways; vegetated swales; P.C.C. ribbon gutters; sewer lateral; and private drainage system. Deviations from applicable regulations for minimum lot width and lot size are also being requested. 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 0.684 acre project site is located on Union Street, north of West Laurel Street and south of West Maple Street. The project site is designated Medium-High Density (29 - 44 dwelling units per acre) and within the MCCPD-MR-1000 and RS-1-1 zones. Additionally, the project site is within the ALUCP Noise Contours (CNEL) Overlay Zone (SD International Airport 65-70 CNEL), the Airport Approach Overlay Zone (SD International Airport (AAOZ 100-150, AAOZ 150-200), the Airport Influence Areas Overlay Zone (SD International Airport - Review Area 1), the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Part 77 Noticing Area Overlay Zone (SD International Airport 30-40 feet Mean Sea Level and North Island NAS 176-181 feet Mean Sea Level), and the Airport Safety Zone Overlay Zone (SD International Airport - Safety Zone 3NE), the Residential Tandem Parking Overlay Zone, the Transit Area Overlay Zone, and the Uptown Community Plan Area and the Park West sub community. (LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Parcel 1 according to Map No. 13590.) (LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Parcel 1 according to Map No. 13590.) Owner: Mary Carlson - City of San Diego Real Estate Assets, and Soheil Nakhshab - NDD Inc.

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 and determined that the proposed project will not have a significant environmental effect 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: NONE REQUIRED

VI. PUBLIC REVIEW DISTRIBUTION: Draft copies or notice of this Negative Declaration were distributed to:

CITY OF SAN DIEGO
Mayor's Office
Councilmember Ward - District 3
City Attorney's Office (93C)
Development Services
  Fire – Plan Review
  LDR – Engineering Review
  LDR – EAS
  LDR – Geology
  LDR – Planning Review
  LDR – Transportation Development
PUD – Water & Sewer Dev.
Planning Department
  Park & Rec.
  Plan – Historic
Facilities Financing (93B)
Water Review (86A)
San Diego Central Library (81A)
Mission Hills Branch Library (81Q)
Historical Resources Board (87)

OTHER ORGANIZATIONS AND INTERESTED PARTIES
South Coastal Information Center (210)
San Diego History Center (211)
San Diego Archaeological Center (212)
Save Our Heritage Organisation (214)
San Diego County Archaeological Society, Inc. (218)
Midletown Property Owner's Assoc (496)
  Attn: R.H. Stowers, Chair
Mission Hills Heritage (497)
  Barry Hager, President
Uptown Planners (498)
  Leo Wilson, Chair
Hillside Protection Assoc (501)
Banker's Hill Canyon Assoc (502)
  c/o Suzanne Richardson
Allen Canyon Committee (504)
UCSD Physical & Community Planning (505)
  Brad Werdick, AICP, Director
VII. RESULTS OF PUBLIC REVIEW:

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

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

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

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

E. Shearer-Nguyen
Senior Planner
Development Services Department

April 12, 2017
Date of Draft Report

May 11, 2017
Date of Final Report

Analyst: L. Sebastian

Attachments: Initial Study Checklist
Figure 1 – Location Map
Figure 2 – Site Plan
April 25, 2015

Re: Project Truax/project No. 509894 /SCH No. N/A

I would like to be notified of any meetings/public hearings involving the Truax house property.

My name is Linda Aurora Espino. I am the owner of the property directly east of the Truax house property.

I am very concerned about the tandem parking mentioned in the notice. The letter had my name incorrectly on it and was delivered to the wrong mailbox. Please send my notice to 2506 Horton Avenue.

1. Comment noted. Your contact information has been added to the Noticing list for any upcoming hearings.

2. Comment noted.

3. Comment noted. Tandem Parking is not proposed with this development plan.
I believe that the medium/high density 29-44 dwelling units per acre is a problem. I think on this property located on an already high trafficked area. Tandem parking looks like no parking to me. Union Street is narrow not allowing two cars to pass each other (on this portion of Union Street.) The visibility is null looking down Laurel Street towards the airport; looking up the street from Union to exit onto Laurel Street the driver can only see up to the corner of Horton & Laurel which has a sharp corner with cars racing as they do up and down Laurel Street between Balboa Park and the airport with already heavy traffic I believe this will only increase accidents making it more dangerous for drivers of cars, bicycles and pedestrians.

Where are the parking spaces going to be if any on the property? As the notice states that there will be no building now on the parcel after it is sold by the City as 3 parcels we know there will be building on it as it is currently considered “medium to high density” which I believe is ridiculous.

Whoever thinks that people will walk up the steep hill or down it for public transit is mistaken. Only the extremely fit will be able to do this if they choose to instead of driving. Only a few people are physically able to ride bicycles up and down the steep hill of Laurel Street.

The area is already congested with traffic going to Balboa Park & the airport.

Laurel Street is not going to be widened and traffic is already heavy with people speeding up and down. The traffic signs telling people not to turn left from Brant street have drivers racing across Laurel Street onto Horton Avenue which is not over 100 feet long with no room for a turnaround having people/drivers/cars in my driveway all during the day and night so that they can then turn right to go down Laurel Street. I see cars making U-turns on Laurel Street endangering other drivers/cars. This behavior will increase with all the proposed dwelling with the medium/high density designation the City has given on this parcel.

We know that the dwellings will have multiple vehicles as it is not practical to not have a car in this area of San Diego and we are so near the freeways.

I am opposed to the division of the parcel into three parcels.

4. No development is proposed at this time. The applicant is allowed by right to develop at 29 - 44 dwelling units per acre per the Uptown Community Plan (Page 35, Figure 5) at a zone designated (RM-3-7) rate of 1 dwelling unit/1,000-square-feet.

5. No development is proposed with this project. The project site is located within the Residential Tandem Parking Overlay Zone.

6. These are existing conditions. The proposed driveway on Union Street would be wide enough for a two-way traffic, and it will be stop controlled at Laurel Street with a "right-turn-only" sign to limit the existing movements at this driveway. The project only proposes the division of land and some street improvements to Union Street. No development is proposed on any of the lots. No proposals for the renovation or redevelopment of the Trux house or the other single-family residence on the corner lot have been received.

7. No development is proposed with the project. Existing conditions are to remain. Any future development proposal would be required to provide the minimum on-site parking required per the San Diego Municipal Code (SDMC). The project site is designated as medium to high density (29 – 44 dwelling units/acre) per the Uptown Community Plan (Page 36, Figure 5) and is allowed by right.

8. Comment noted. These are existing conditions.

9. Comment noted. No impacts with regard to transportation/traffic were identified in the Negative Declaration.

10. These are existing conditions. No development is proposed with the project, and no impacts with regard to transportation/traffic were identified in the Negative Declaration. The proposed driveway on Union Street will be stop controlled at Laurel Street with a "right-turn-only" sign to limit the existing movements at this driveway.

11. Comment noted. No development is proposed with the project.

12. Comment noted.
Union Street is situated on a half block and a short block of less than 100 feet and there is a very steep slope. Even in a large high vehicle it is difficult to judge when to exit Union Street to turn up or down the hill. Vision is only one block up the hill to Horton Avenue at the corner of Horton & Laurel Street. There is a sharp bend in Laurel Street there. So when the cars/drivers come rushing down the hill there will be increased danger to vehicles/drivers. This is where the STOP sign is on the wrong side of the street. Vision down the hill to cars coming up the hill is virtually none.

The City planning committee & City has deemed this area "medium to high density". This will increase the danger to pedestrians, vehicles and possibly property. There are people making U-turns on the steep hill of Laurel Street (which seems crazy to me as they cannot see up or down the steep Laurel Street hill for the cars speeding up and down the hill.

The signage on Curlew Street/Horton Avenue on the south side, SE corner has a sign that states "No left turn" onto Laurel St so the cars race across the lanes of traffic on Laurel St across onto the ½ block, less than 100 feet street area to turn around in my driveway to make the turn around to then go back to Laurel Street to go down the hill. This is dangerous.

The Union Street adjacent to the Truax house is visually worse than my Horton Street.

An estimate of 40 additional cars coming in & out of Union Street will make the area even more dangerous. (I am estimating 15 units x 2 cars = 30 plus the apartments in the remodeled Truax house guessing at 6; plus the people who will rent the main floor for private or public use at least 10 so a guess of 46 additional cars/vehicles. That does not include the people in the apartments across the street on Union St across from the Truax house and the private owners of homes on Union down the hill from the Truax house. This all sounds like a horrible mess and many more accidents.

I have heard that the City thinks that we are near public transportation and so do not need parking spaces. This is not correct already the neighbors are fighting over the few parking spaces that are on the ½ block long streets and Laurel Street. These problems will only increase with "medium to high density". 

13. These are existing conditions. The proposed driveway on Union Street will be stop controlled at Laurel Street with a "right-turn-only" sign to limit the exiting movements at this driveway.

14. No development is proposed with this project. These are existing conditions. The project site is designated as medium to high density (29 - 44 dwelling units/acre) per the Uptown Community Plan (Page 36, Figure 5) and zoned RM-3-7 (1 dwelling unit/1,000-square-feet), and is allowed by right.

15. Comment noted. These are existing conditions.

16. Comment noted.

17. No development is proposed with the project, and no impacts with regard to transportation/traffic were identified in the Negative Declaration. The project site is designated as medium to high density (29 - 44 dwelling units/acre) per the Uptown Community Plan (Page 36, Figure 5) and zoned RM-3-7 (1 dwelling unit/1,000-square-feet), and is allowed by right.

18. No development is proposed with the project. Although the parking requirement for projects within transit area may be lower (typically 15 percent lower), any future development proposal would be required to provide the minimum on-site parking requirement per the SDMC.
The proposal we have heard is for the City to have tandem parking is impractical for the steep driveway entrance from Laurel Street to the current Truax house building on the property.

My property is directly east of the Truax house property.

There are serious concerns about the amount of traffic a 29-44 dwellings will have, along with the Truax house being divided into apartments & the main floor into a community room for rent, with the possibility of row houses along Laurel Street.

Parking is an issue currently on these blocks. These blocks of Horton Avenue, Union Street and the other adjacent blocks leading to Laurel Street have visual issues, in other words, vision when attempting to leave these streets onto Laurel is very much impaired by the steepness of Laurel Street.

Maybe we need to meet on the property in question so that you can see for yourselves exactly what the issues/concerns/problems are.

Please let me know that you received my email.

Linda Aurora Espino
2502-2512 Horton Avenue
San Diego, CA 92101
619 702 3001
Mgardencontessa@gmail.com

19. No development is proposed with the project. Existing conditions are to remain. The project site is designated as medium to high density (29 – 44 dwelling units/acre) per the Uptown Community Plan (Page 36, Figure 5) and zoned RM-3-7 (1 dwelling unit/1,000-square-feet), and is allowed by right. The property is within the Residential Tandem Parking Overlay Zone, but there is no development proposed.

20. Comment noted.

21. No development is proposed with the project. Existing conditions are to remain. The project site is designated as medium to high density (29 – 44 dwelling units/acre) per the Uptown Community Plan (Page 36, Figure 5) and zoned RM-3-7 (1 dwelling unit/1,000-square-feet), and is allowed by right. The project is only for the division of land and no development is proposed on any of the lots, only some street improvements to Union Street are proposed. No proposals for the renovation or redevelopment of the Truax house or the other single-family residence on the corner lot have been received by the City.

22. These are existing conditions. The proposed driveway on Union Street will be stop controlled at Laurel Street with a "right-turn-only" sign to limit the exiting movements at this driveway. No development is proposed with the project, and no impacts with regard to transportation/traffic were identified in the Negative Declaration.

23. Comment noted.
May 1, 2017

To: Lindsey Sebastian; William Zounes;

What does "pedestrian ramps crossing over Union Street" entail? Steps up and down from bridge over Union Street? I do not understand, please explain it to me so that I can picture it. In fact is there a picture/rendering for the "ramp"? Will cars go under it and pedestrians under it? Union Street seems too narrow for that. The proposal calls for a "hammerhead" does that mean all cars will be doing 3-way turns to get back to the intersection of Union Street & Laurel Street? That sounds awkward to me. Seems like all of Union Street which the Truax Property is adjacent to should be upgraded not just a "portion" as the Draft MND - Truax - Project No. 509894 Date 4-12-17

Also, I think that although no additional buildings are proposed currently. We all know that in the future there will be. I think that a "hammerhead" will not be adequate for all the cars from the current dwellings combined with the vehicles from the current zoning of 29-44 units proposed per acre. There currently are apartments that park on Union Street along with homes already located on Union Street. It sounds like a mess to me.

The stop sign on Union Street on the NW corner is on the opposite of the street than normal placement of a stop sign. There is no/null/zero visibility of traffic coming up the street on Laurel Street making a left hand turn up Laurel Street dangerous. Cars coming/traveling down Laurel Street pass Union Street on the Truax side will not be able to see the vehicles existing the Truax property/Union Street. The additional vehicles will make the street more dangerous for pedestrians, bicyclists and vehicles due to the steepness of Laurel Street.

City staff response(s) to the Linda Aurora Espino comment(s) letter dated May 1, 2017 for Truax, Project No. 509894

24. No pedestrian ramps are proposed crossing Union Street. A new driveway, curb, gutter and sidewalk will be provided across Union Street. All proposed improvements will be at grade. Please see Figure No. 2 of the Negative Declaration for proposed improvements.

25. Please refer to Comment 24. Additionally, the proposed driveway within Union Street is to allow adequate two-way access to the properties within this area in consideration of the existing topography and limitations. The hammerhead is to allow vehicular turn around area the north end of Union Street.

26. No development is proposed with this project. Existing conditions are to remain. The project site is designated as medium to high density (29 – 44 dwelling units/acre) per the Uptown Community Plan (Page 36, Figure 5) and zoned RM-3-7 (1 dwelling unit/1,000-square-feet), and is allowed by right. This project is only for the division of land.

27. These are existing conditions. There are no additional units proposed at this time. The proposed driveway on Union Street will be stop controlled at Laurel Street, with a "right-turn-only" sign to limit the existing movements at this driveway.
So please add my comments to a reply on the Draft MND - Truxx - Project No. 509894 Date 4-12-17.

Thank you,

Linda Aurora Espino
property owner of the property east of the Truxx parcel
2506 Horton Avenue
SD, CA 92101
619-702 3001
msagrencomtesse@gmail.com
Lindsey Sebastian  
City of San Diego Development Services Center  
1222 First Avenue, MS 501  
San Diego, CA

RE Negative Declaration

Please provide information on how a project applicant which does not own the property is able to apply for Tentative Map and Site Development permit. The property is owned by the City of San Diego. Should the City be the applicant?

Charles Kaminski  
P.O. Box 2772  
La Jolla, CA 92038  
858-956-9141

City staff response(s) to the Charles Kaminsky comment(s) letter dated April 28, 2017 for Truax, Project No. 506894

29. Comment noted. The comment does not speak to the adequacy or accuracy of the Negative Declaration. However, San Diego Municipal Code Section 112.0102 states that the following persons are deemed to have the authority to file a development permit application: (1) The record owner of the real property that is the subject of the permit, map, or other matter; (2) The property owner’s authorized agent; or (3) Any other person who can demonstrate a legal right, interest, or entitlement to the use of the real property subject to the application. The project applicant has placed an offer to purchase the property from the City, which is currently going through escrow. Therefore although the City owns the property, the project applicant can apply for the Tentative Map and Site Development permit because he can demonstrate a legal right, interest, or entitlement to the use of the real property subject to the application.
Additional comment to MND:

The sale agreement contains language:

"Buyer shall develop the Property in a manner that preserves, restores and memorializes the Brad Truax House ... including dedicating the ground floor as a community center, with communal courtyard space."

Shouldn't that be the focus of preservation efforts? To clarify that the intent is that the main floor should be considered ground floor and be dedicated as a community center, not the partially below-ground basement.

Also that communal courtyard space be dedicated and delineated clearly and defined.

Charles Kaminski

City staff response(s) to the Charles Kaminsky comment(s) letter dated May 2, 2017 for Truax, Project No. 509894

30. Comment noted. The comment does not speak to the adequacy or accuracy of the Negative Declaration. No development, including any improvements to the Truax house are proposed.
INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

1. Project title/Project number: Truax / 509894

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

3. Contact person and phone number: L. Sebastian / (619) 236-5993

4. Project location: 2513 Union Street, San Diego, California 92101

5. Project Applicant/Sponsor's name and address: Solheil Nakhshab, 2900 4th Avenue, #100, San Diego, California 92103


7. Zoning: MCCPD-MR-1000 and RS-1-1 zones

8. Description of project (Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to, later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation.):

A TENTATIVE MAP and SITE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT for the subdivision of one existing parcel into three parcels. The project site contains two existing single-family residences that would remain. No structures would be constructed. Private improvements within the right-of-way to access existing parcels and to provide a hammerhead turn-around for vehicles are proposed, including a retaining wall; curb; curb and gutter; pavement driveways; vegetated swales; P.C.C. ribbon gutters; sewer lateral; and private drainage system. Deviations from applicable regulations for minimum lot width and lot size are also being requested.

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).
Grading operations for the private improvements would entail approximately 95 cubic yards of cut with a maximum cut depth of five feet, and approximately five cubic yards of fill with a maximum fill depth of one foot. Additionally, 100 cubic yards of export is proposed.

The San Diego Municipal Code (SDMC), Section 158.0206(a)(3) allows projects to request deviations from applicable development regulations pursuant to a Site Development Permit (SDP) decided in accordance with Process Three, provided that the findings in SDMC Section 126.0504(a) and the findings in SDMC Section 158.0206(d)(1) through (4) are made. Deviations requested by the project include:

1. Lot Width – A deviation from SDMC Section Table 1512-03A for a corner lot (Parcel 1) should be 65 feet, requesting 50 feet; and Parcel 2 should be 60 feet, requesting 53 feet.

2. Lot Size – A deviation from SDMC Table 1512-03B for a 5,882 square foot lot size, where 6,000 square feet is required.

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

The 0.684 acre project site is located on Union Street, north of West Laurel Street and south of West Maple Street. The project site is designated Medium-High Density (29 - 44 dwelling units per acre) and within the MCCPD-MR-1000 and RS-1-1 zones. Additionally, the project site is within the ALUCP Noise Contours (CNEL) Overlay Zone (SD International Airport 65-70 CNEL), the Airport Approach Overlay Zone (SD International Airport (AAOZ 100-150, AAOZ 150-200), the Airport Influence Areas Overlay Zone (SD International Airport - Review Area 1), the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Part 77 Noticing Area Overlay Zone (SD International Airport 30-40 feet Mean Sea Level and North Island NAS 176-181 feet Mean Sea Level), and the Airport Safety Zone Overlay Zone (SD International Airport - Safety Zone 3NE), the Residential Tandem Parking Overlay Zone, the Transit Area Overlay Zone, and the Uptown Community Plan Area and the Park West sub community.

Parcels one and two of the project site are each developed with a structure. Parcel three is currently undeveloped. The project site is bordered by developed residential properties to the north, south, east, and west. Vegetation on-site is varied and consists of non-native landscaping flora, including shrubs, trees, and lawn areas. Additionally, the project site is situated in a developed area currently served by existing public services and utilities.

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

None required.
11. Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.17? If so, has consultation begun?

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

A Native American Tribe traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area has requested consultation with the City of San Diego pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21082.3 (c). The City is in consultation with this tribe. The project site is located on the City of San Diego's Historical Resources Sensitivity map. Therefore, a record search of the California Historic Resources Information System (CHRIS) digital database was conducted and reviewed by qualified archaeological City staff to determine presence or absence of potential resources within the project site. No on-site archaeological resources were identified; however, several sites were identified within the one-mile radius. Qualified City staff concluded that a survey should be conducted to determine if any further archaeological evaluations would be required because portions of the project site are vacant.

An archaeological survey was conducted by qualified City staff on November 10, 2016 for the project. The project site was surveyed and evaluated for surface evidence of historic and prehistoric resources. The existing homes on the project site are surrounded by single and multi-family dwelling units. The survey was focused on the north side of the project site because that area lacks development. Disturbed and ornamental vegetation was present, but overall ground visibility was good. This area also contained slopes exceeding 25 percent grade. No resources were observed during the survey. It appeared that the area has been disturbed.

After the review of previous research in the area and based upon the scope of work, negative survey and the disturbed nature of the site, it was determined that the project would not result in impacts to buried archaeological/historical resources. Further archaeological investigations or mitigation would not be required.
ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

☐ Aesthetics  ☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions  ☐ Population/Housing
☐ Agriculture and Forestry Resources  ☐ Hazards & Hazardous Materials  ☐ Public Services
☐ Air Quality  ☐ Hydrology/Water Quality  ☐ Recreation
☐ Biological Resources  ☐ Land Use/Planning  ☐ Transportation/Traffic
☐ Cultural Resources  ☐ Mineral Resources  ☐ Tribal Cultural Resources
☐ Geology/Soils  ☐ Noise  ☐ Utilities/Service System
☒ Mandatory Findings Significance

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

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

2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

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

5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or (mitigated) negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:

   a. Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.

   b. Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.

   c. Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less Than Significant With Mitigation Measures Incorporated", describe the mitigation measures that were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

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

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

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

9) The explanation of each issue should identify:

   a. The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and

   b. The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significant.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>l) AESTHETICS - Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No scenic vista or view corridor designated within the community plan exists on the project site. Therefore, the project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista. No impacts would result.

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

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

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

The project site is within a developed residential neighborhood. The project is compatible with the surrounding development, and permitted by the community plan and zoning designation. The project would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site or the surrounding area. Also see response l(a) above. No impacts are anticipated.

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

The project would not be expected to create new and/or cause substantial light or glare. No substantial sources of light would be generated during project construction, as construction activities would occur during daylight hours. All permanent exterior lighting is required to comply with City regulations to reduce potential adverse effects on neighborhood properties. No impacts are anticipated.

II. AGRICULTURAL AND FOREST RESOURCES: In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. – Would the project:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Converts Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

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

c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 1220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |

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

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

Refer to response II(c) above. Additionally, the project would not contribute to the conversion of any forested land to non-forest use, as surrounding land uses are built out. No impacts would result.
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Refer to responses II(a) and (c) above. No impacts would result.

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

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

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

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

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

The project would subdivide one parcel into three parcels. Although no development is proposed, the project would provide private improvements within the right-of-way for access to existing parcels. The project site contains two existing structures. The project would remain consistent with the General Plan, community plan, and the underlying zoning for residential development. Therefore, the project would be consistent at a sub-regional level with the underlying growth
forecasts in the RAQS, and would not obstruct implementation of the RAQS. As such, no impacts would result.

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

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

Short-term Emissions (Construction)

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

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

Long-term Emissions (Operational)

Long-term air emission impacts are those associated with stationary sources and mobile sources related to any change caused by a project. The project would produce minimal stationary source emissions. Long-term air emissions typically associated with residential uses would remain the same because the project would subdivide one existing parcel into three parcels, and the two existing structures would remain. No structures would be constructed. The project would remain compatible with the surrounding development and would continue to be permitted by the community plan and zone designation. Based on the existing residential land use, project emissions over the long-term are not anticipated to violate any air quality standard or contribute
substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

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

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

Short-term (Construction)
Odors would be generated from vehicles and/or equipment exhaust emissions during construction associated with the proposed private improvements within the right-of-way would for the project. Odors produced during construction would be attributable to concentrations of unburned hydrocarbons from tailpipes of construction equipment and architectural coatings. Such odors are temporary and generally occur at magnitudes that would not affect a substantial number of people. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Long-term (Operational)
Typical long-term operational characteristics of the project are not associated with the creation of such odors nor anticipated to generate odors affecting a substantial number of people. The project would subdivide one existing parcel into three parcels, and the two existing structures would remain. No structures would be constructed. Residential dwelling units, in the long-term operation, are not typically associated with the creation of such odors nor are they anticipated to
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>generate odors affecting a substantial number or people. Therefore, project operations would remain the same and result in no impacts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

a) Have substantial adverse effects, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?  

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

A Preliminary Biological Resources Assessment (Assessment) dated October 20, 2016 was prepared by Vincent N. Scheidt. The Assessment determined that impacts to on-site biological resources would be less than significant because the project would only impact non-native vegetation and disturbed habitat, which are Tier IV habitats that do not require mitigation.

The Assessment determined that the project site does not contain any sensitive biological resources, nor does it contain any candidate, sensitive or special status species or habitat. No impacts would occur, and no mitigation measures are required.

b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Refer to response IV(a) above. The project site consists of non-native vegetation and disturbed habitat. No wetlands occur onsite. The project site does not contain any riparian habitat or other identified community. Additionally, the project site is located within a developed residential neighborhood. No impacts would result.

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

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

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

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

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
|  |  |  | ☒ |

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

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

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
|  |  |  | ☒ |

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

f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
|  |  |  | ☒ |

Refer to response IV(e) above. The project site is located within a developed urban neighborhood and is not within, nor adjacent to, the City's Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA). Therefore, no impacts would result.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource as defined in §15064.5?

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
|  |  |  | ☒ |

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

Archaeological Resources
Many areas of San Diego County, including mesas and the coast, are known for intense and diverse prehistoric occupation and important archaeological resources. The region has been inhabited by various cultural groups spanning 10,000 years or more.

The project site is located on the City of San Diego’s Historical Resources Sensitivity map. Therefore, a record search of the California Historic Resources Information System (CHRIS) digital database was conducted and reviewed by qualified archaeological City staff to determine presence or absence of potential resources within the project site. No on-site archaeological resources were identified; however, several sites were identified within the one-mile radius. Qualified City staff concluded that a survey should be conducted to determine if any further archaeological evaluations would be required because portions of the project site are vacant.

An archaeological survey was conducted by qualified City staff on November 10, 2016 for the project. The project site was surveyed and evaluated for surface evidence of historic and prehistoric resources. The existing homes on the project site are surrounded by single and multi-family dwelling units. The survey was focused on the north side of the project site because that area lacks development. Disturbed and ornamental vegetation was present, but overall ground visibility was good. This area also contained slopes exceeding 25 percent grade. No resources were observed during the survey. It appeared that the area has been disturbed.

After the review of previous research in the area and based upon the scope of work, negative survey and the disturbed nature of the site, it was determined that the project would not result in impacts to buried archaeological/historical resources. Further archaeological investigations or mitigation would not be required. Therefore, it was determined that there is no potential to impact any unique or non-unique historical resources. No impacts would result.

Built Environment
The City of San Diego reviews projects requiring the demolition of structures 45 years or older for historic significance in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). CEQA Section 21084.1 states that “A project that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource is a project that may cause a significant effect on the environment.” Historic property (built environment) surveys are required for properties which are 45 years of age or older and which have integrity of setting, location, design, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association.
The project site located at 2513 - 2515 Union Street is a designated historic resource and is listed as Historic Resources Board Site No. 1225. The project would include the installation of solar panels at the northeast portion of the roof of the designated historic resource. Plan – Historic staff reviewed the project and determined that the project, as presented, is consistent with the U.S. Secretary of the Interior’s Standards. Therefore, no impacts would result.

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

Refer to response V(a) above.

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

Per the submitted Geotechnical Investigation prepared by Allied Earth Technology dated October 20, 2016, the project site is underlain by San Diego Formation, Lindavista Formation, and undocumented fill soils. San Diego Formation is assigned a high sensitivity rating for paleontological resources. Lindavista Formation is assigned a moderate sensitivity rating for paleontological resources. Fill soils are not sensitive for paleontological resources.

Pursuant to the City of San Diego’s Significance Determination Thresholds, projects that require over 2,000 cubic yards of excavation, and at depths over 10 feet within a moderate sensitivity area, could result in impacts to these resources. Grading operations would entail approximately 95 cubic yards of cut with a maximum cut depth of five feet, and approximately five cubic yards of fill with a maximum fill depth of one foot. Additionally, 100 cubic yards of export is proposed. Consequently, the project does not have the potential to disturb or destroy paleontological resources and therefore, does not exceed the threshold for paleontological monitoring.

d) Disturb and human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?

Refer to response V(a) above. No cemeteries, formal or informal, have been identified on the project site; therefore, no impacts would result.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS – Would the project:

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

i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial
The project is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Fault Zone. The project would subdivide one parcel into three parcels. No structures would be constructed. The project is required to comply with the seismic requirements of the California Building Code. Implementation of proper engineering design and utilization of standard construction practices for the proposed private improvements within the right-of-way, to be verified at the building permit stage, would ensure that the potential for impacts from regional geologic hazards would remain less than significant.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

The project site is located within a seismically active southern California region, and is potentially subject to moderate to strong seismic ground shaking along major earthquake faults. Seismic shaking at the site could be generated by any number of known active and potentially active faults in the region. The project would subdivide one parcel into three parcels. No structures would be constructed. Implementation of proper engineering design and utilization of standard construction practices for the proposed private improvements within the right-of-way, to be verified at the building permit stage, would ensure that the potential for impacts from regional geologic hazards would remain less than significant.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Refer to response VI(a)(ii) above. The site could be affected by seismic activity as a result of earthquakes and major active faults located throughout the Southern California area. Liquefaction occurs when loose, unconsolidated, water-laden soils are subject to shaking, causing the soils to lose cohesion. The project would subdivide one parcel into three parcels. No structures would be constructed. Implementation of proper engineering design and utilization of standard construction practices for the proposed private improvements within the right-of-way, to be verified at the building permit stage, would ensure that the potential for impacts from regional geologic hazards would remain less than significant.

iv) Landslides? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

According to the City of San Diego Seismic Safety Study 2008, the project site is located in Geologic Hazard Category 52. Hazard Category 52 is characterized as "Other Terrain – other level areas, gently sloping to steep terrain, favorable geologic structure, low risk." The project would subdivide one parcel into three parcels. No structures would be constructed. Implementation of proper engineering design and utilization of standard construction practices for the proposed private improvements within the right-of-way, to be verified at the building permit stage, would
ensure that the potential for impacts from regional geologic hazards would remain less than significant.

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

☐ ☐ ✗ ☐

Construction of the proposed private improvements within the right-of-way would temporarily disturb on-site soils during grading activities, thereby increasing the potential for soil erosion to occur. However, the use of standard erosion control measures and implementation of storm water BMP requirements during construction would reduce potential impacts to a less than a significant level. Additionally, the project site would be landscaped in accordance with City requirements, which would also preclude erosion or topsoil loss, and all storm water requirements would be met. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

☐ ☐ ✗ ☐

Refer to response VI(a) above. As previously discussed, the project site is located in Geologic Hazard Category 52. Geologic Hazard Category 52 is defined as “Other Terrain – other level areas, gently sloping to steep terrain, favorable geologic structure, low risk.” The project would subdivide one parcel into three parcels. No structures would be constructed. Implementation of proper engineering design and utilization of standard construction practices for the proposed private improvements within the right-of-way, to be verified at the building permit stage, would ensure that the potential for impacts from regional geologic hazards would remain less than significant.

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

☐ ☐ ✗ ☐

Refer to response VI(a) above. The project would subdivide one parcel into three parcels. No structures would be constructed. The proposed private improvements within the right-of-way would be constructed in accordance with the California Building Code and appropriate engineering design. Utilization of appropriate engineering design measures and standard construction practices, to be verified at the building permit stage, would ensure that the potential for impacts from geologic hazards would be less than significant. Therefore, impacts related to unstable soils are considered less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No septic system or alternative wastewater systems are proposed. The project would subdivide one parcel into three parcels. No structures would be constructed. The project site is located within an urban area that is already developed with existing infrastructure (i.e., water and sewer lines). No impacts would result.

VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS – Would the project:

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

The City’s Climate Action Plan (CAP) outlines the actions that the City will undertake to achieve its proportional share of State greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reductions. A CAP Consistency Checklist (Checklist) is part of the CAP and contains measures that are required to be implemented on a project-by-project basis to ensure that the specified emission targets identified in the CAP are achieved.

The project is consistent with the existing General Plan and Community Plan land use and zoning designations. Further based upon review and evaluation of the completed CAP Consistency Checklist for the project, the project is a discretionary map action that does not propose specific development and would therefore not result in new occupancy buildings from which GHG emissions reductions could be achieved. No mitigation is required.

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

The project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purposes of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases. The project is consistent with the existing General Plan and Community Plan land use and zoning designations. Further based upon review and evaluation of the completed CAP Consistency Checklist for the project, the project is a discretionary map action that does not propose specific development and would therefore not result in new occupancy buildings from which GHG emissions reductions could be achieved. No mitigation is required.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS - Would the project:

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

The project would subdivide one parcel into three parcels. No structures would be constructed. Construction of the proposed private improvements within the right-of-way may require the use of hazardous material (fuel, lubricants, solvents, etc.) that would require proper storage, handling, use and disposal. Although minimal amounts of such substances may be present during construction of the proposed private improvements within the right-of-way, they are not anticipated to create a significant public hazard. Once the proposed private improvements are completed, the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials on or through the project site is not anticipated. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

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

Refer to response VIII(a) above. The project would subdivide one parcel into three parcels. No structures would be constructed. The project would not be associated with such impacts. Therefore, no significant impacts related to this issue were identified, and no mitigation measures are required.

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

Refer to responses VIII(a) and VIII (b) above. The project site is not within one quarter mile of a school. The project would subdivide one parcel into three parcels. The two existing structures would remain. No structures would be constructed. Future risk of releases of hazardous substances would not occur as a result of project operations because it is anticipated that future on-site operations would remain the same and would not require the routine use or transport of acutely hazardous materials.

Construction of the proposed private improvements within the right-of-way may require the use of hazardous materials (fuels, lubricants, solvents, etc.), which would require proper storage, handling, use and disposal. Further, the project would be required to comply with all federal,
state and local requirements associated with hazardous materials; therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

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

The project site is not listed as a hazardous materials site in public records databases (i.e., Envirostor, Geotracker). Therefore, the project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. No impacts would result.

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

The project site is located within the ALUCP Noise Contours (CNEL) Overlay Zone (SD International Airport 65-70 CNEL), the Airport Approach Overlay Zone (SD International Airport (AAOZ 100-150, AAOZ 150-200), the Airport Influence Areas Overlay Zone (SD International Airport - Review Area 1), the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Part 77 Noticing Area Overlay Zone (SD International Airport 30-40 feet Mean Sea Level and North Island NAS 176-181 feet Mean Sea Level), and the Airport Safety Zone Overlay Zone (SD International Airport - Safety Zone 3NE), identified in the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) for San Diego International Airport. The basic function of the ALUCP (2014) is to promote compatibility between airports and the land uses that surround them to the extent that these areas are not already devoted to incompatible land uses. The ALUCP safeguards the general welfare of the inhabitants within the vicinity of San Diego International Airport and the public in general. The ALUCP provides policies and criteria for the City of San Diego to implement and for the Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) to use when reviewing development proposals.

Although the project site is located within an airport land use plan, the project would not result in a safety hazard residing in the project area. Per the San Diego International Airport ALUCP, Review Area 2 is defined by the combination of the airspace protection and overflight boundaries beyond Review Area 1. Only airspace protection and overflight policies and standards apply within Review Area 2. No impacts would result.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

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

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

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

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY - Would the project:

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

The project would subdivide one parcel into three parcels. No structures would be constructed. The project would comply with all storm water quality standards during and after construction of the proposed private improvements within the right-of-way, and appropriate Best Management Practices (BMP’s) must be utilized. Implementation of theses BMP’s would preclude any violations of existing standards and discharge regulations. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

The project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or the area. The project would subdivide one parcel into three parcels. No structures would be constructed. There are no streams or rivers located on-site and thus, no such resources would be impacted through the proposed grading activities. Although grading would be required for the proposed private improvements within the right-of-way, the project would implement BMPs to ensure that substantial erosion or siltation on or off-site would not occur. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

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

The project would subdivide one parcel into three parcels. No structures would be constructed. The project would implement low impact development principles during construction of the proposed private improvements within the right-of-way ensuring that a substantial increase in the rate or amount of surface runoff resulting in flooding on or off-site, or a substantial alteration to the existing drainage pattern would not occur. Streams or rivers do not occur on or adjacent to the project site. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

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

The project would not create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff.
The project would subdivide one parcel into three parcels. No structures would be constructed. The project would comply with all City storm water quality standards during and after construction of the proposed private improvements within the right-of-way. Appropriate BMP’s would be implemented to ensure that water quality is not degraded; therefore, ensuring that the project runoff is directed to appropriate drainage systems. Due to the nature of the project, any runoff from the site is not anticipated to exceed the capacity of existing storm water systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff that would require new or expanded facilities. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

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

The project would subdivide one parcel into three parcels. No structures would be constructed. The project would comply with all City storm water quality standards during and after construction of the proposed private improvements within the right-of-way. Appropriate BMP’s would be implemented to ensure that water quality is not degraded. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>g)</td>
<td>Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>h)</td>
<td>Place within a 100-year flood hazard area, structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING – Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Physically divide an established community?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The project would subdivide one parcel into three parcels. The project site contains two existing single-family residences that would remain. No structures would be constructed. The project would remain consistent with the General Plan’s and Community Plan’s land use designation. The project site is located within a developed residential neighborhood and surrounded by similar residential development. The project would not affect adjacent properties and would remain
consistent with surrounding land uses. Therefore, the project would not physically divide an established community. No impacts would result.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See response X(a) above. The project would subdivide one parcel into three parcels. The project site contains two existing single-family residences that would remain. No structures would be constructed. The project would remain compatible with the area designated for residential development by the General Plan and Community Plan, and would remain consistent with the existing underlying zone and surrounding land uses with allowable deviations.

The San Diego Municipal Code (SDMC), Section 158.0206(a)(3) allows projects to request deviations from applicable development regulations pursuant to a Site Development Permit (SDP) decided in accordance with Process Three, provided that the findings in SDMC Section 126.0504(a) and the findings in SDMC Section 158.0206(d)(1) through (4) are made. Deviations requested by the project include:

1. Lot Width – A deviation from SDMC Section Table 1512-03A for a corner lot (Parcel 1) should be 65 feet, requesting 50 feet; and Parcel 2 should be 60 feet, requesting 53 feet.

2. Lot Size – A deviation from SDMC Table 1512-03B for a 5,882 square foot lot size, where 6,000 square feet is required.

Construction of the proposed private improvements within the right-of-way would occur within an urbanized neighborhood with similar development. Furthermore, the project would not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including but not limited to the general plan, community plan, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. No conflict would occur and thus, no impacts would result.

c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☑ |

The project would subdivide one parcel into three parcels. The project site contains two existing single-family residences that would remain. No structures would be constructed. The project is
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Located within a developed residential neighborhood and would not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. The project would not conflict with the City's Multiple Species Conservation Plan (MSCP), in that the site is not located within or adjacent to the MHPA. No significant impacts would occur, and no mitigation measures are required.

XI. MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the project?

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

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

There are no known mineral resources located on the project site. The urbanized and developed nature of the project site and vicinity would preclude the extraction of any such resources. No impacts would result.

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

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

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

XII. NOISE – Would the project result in:

a) Generation of, noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?  

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Short-term noise impacts would be associated with the proposed private improvements within the right-of-way. Construction-related short-term noise levels would be higher than existing ambient noise levels in the project area, but would no longer occur once construction is completed. Sensitive receptors (e.g. residential uses) occur in the immediate area and may be temporarily affected by construction noise; however, construction activities would be required to comply with the construction hours specified in the City’s Municipal Code (Section 59.5.0404, Construction Noise), which are intended to reduce potential adverse effects resulting from construction noise. With compliance to the City’s construction noise requirements, project
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

construction noise levels would be reduced to less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

The project would subdivide one parcel into three parcels. The project site contains two existing single-family residences that would remain. No structures would be constructed. For the long-term, typical noise levels associated with the existing residential uses are anticipated, and the project would not result in an increase in the existing ambient noise level. The project would not result in noise levels in excess of standards established in the City of San Diego General Plan or Noise Ordinance. No significant long-term impacts would occur, and no mitigation measures are required.

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

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

See response XII(a) above. Potential effects from construction noise related to the proposed private improvements within the right-of-way would be reduced through compliance with City restrictions. Pile driving activities that would potentially result in ground borne vibration or ground borne noise are not anticipated with construction of the project. No impacts would result.

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

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The project would not significantly increase long-term noise levels. The project would subdivide one parcel into three parcels. The project site contains two existing single-family residences that would remain. No structures would be constructed. The project would not introduce a new land use or significantly increase the intensity of the allowed land use. Post-construction noise levels and traffic would remain unchanged as compared to noise with the existing residential use. Therefore, no substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels is anticipated. A less than significant impact would result.

d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above existing without the project?

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The project would not expose people to a substantial increase in temporary or periodic ambient noise levels. Construction noise associated with the proposed private improvements within the right-of-way would result during grading and construction activities, but would be temporary in nature. Construction-related noise impacts from the project would generally be higher than existing ambient noise levels in the project area, but would no longer occur once construction of the proposed private improvements within the right-of-way is completed. In addition, the project
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For a project located within an airport land use plan, or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport would the project expose people residing or working in the area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The project is located in the 65 to 70 decibel (dB) Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) as depicted in the ALUCP. Although the project site is located within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, the project is a map action that would subdivide one parcel into three parcels. No structures would be constructed. No impacts would result.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>f)</th>
<th></th>
<th>☐</th>
<th>☐</th>
<th>☒</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING – Would the project:

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>☐</th>
<th>☐</th>
<th>☒</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The project site is located in a developed residential neighborhood, and is surrounded by similar residential development. The project site currently receives water and sewer service from the City, and no extension of infrastructure to new areas is required. Further, the project would subdivide one parcel into three parcels. The project site contains two existing structures that would remain. No structures would be constructed. As such, the project would not substantially increase housing or population growth in the area. No impacts would result.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>☐</th>
<th>☐</th>
<th>☒</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
The project site is currently developed with two existing structures, and no such displacement would occur in that the project would subdivide one parcel into three parcels. No structures would be constructed. No impacts would result.

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

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

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

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES

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

   i) Fire Protection

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

The project site is located in an urbanized and developed area where fire protection services are already provided. Further, the project would subdivide one parcel into three parcels. The project site contains two existing structures that would remain. No structures would be constructed. The project would not adversely affect existing levels of fire protection services to the area, and would not require the construction of new, or expansion of, existing governmental facilities. No impacts would result.

   ii) Police Protection

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

The project site is located in an urbanized and developed area within the City of San Diego where police protection services are already provided. Further, the project would subdivide one parcel into three parcels. The project site contains two existing structures that would remain. No structures would be constructed. The project would not adversely affect existing levels of police protection services to the area or create significant new demand for such services. Additionally, the project would not require the construction of new, or expansion of, existing governmental facilities. No impacts would result.

   iii) Schools

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

The project site is located in an urbanized and developed area where public school services are available. The project would not significantly increase the demand on public schools over that which currently exists. Further, the project would subdivide one parcel into three parcels. The project site contains two existing structures that would remain. No structures would be
constructed. The project is not anticipated to result in a significant increase in demand for public educational services. No impacts would result.

\[\text{v) Parks}\]

The project site is located in an urbanized and developed area where City-operated parks are available. Further, the project would subdivide one parcel into three parcels. The project site contains two existing structures that would remain. No structures would be constructed. The project would not significantly increase the demand on existing neighborhood or regional parks, or other recreational facilities, over that which presently exists. The project is not anticipated to result in a significant increase in demand for parks or other offsite recreational facilities. No impacts would result.

\[\text{vi) Other public facilities}\]

The project site is located in an urbanized and developed area where City services are already available. Further, the project would subdivide one parcel into three parcels. The project site contains two existing structures residences that would remain. No structures would be constructed. The project would not require the construction of new, or expansion of, existing governmental facilities. No impacts would result.

**XV. RECREATION**

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

The project would subdivide one parcel into three parcels. The project site contains two existing structures that would remain. No structures would be constructed. Therefore, the project would not adversely affect the availability of and/or need for new or expanded recreational resources. The project would not adversely affect existing levels of public services, and would not require the construction or expansion of an existing governmental facility. The project would not significantly increase the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities. Therefore, the project is not anticipated to result in the use of available parks or facilities such that substantial deterioration occurs, or that would require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities to satisfy demand. As such, no significant impacts related to recreational facilities have been identified, and no mitigation measures are required.

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

See response to XIV(a) above. The project would subdivide one parcel into three parcels. The project site contains two existing structures that would remain. No structures would be constructed. The project does not propose recreation facilities, nor does it require the construction or expansion of any such facilities. No impacts would result.

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC – Would the project?

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

The project would subdivide one parcel into three parcels. The project site contains two existing structures that would remain. No structures would be constructed. The project would not change existing circulation patterns on area roadways; however, a temporary minor increase in traffic may occur during construction of the proposed private improvements within the right-of-way. The project would not conflict with any applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system. The project is not expected to cause a significant short-term or long-term increase in traffic volumes, and thus, would not adversely affect existing levels of service along area roadways. Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

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

Refer to response XVI(a) above. The project would subdivide one parcel into three parcels. The project site contains two existing structures that would remain. No structures would be constructed. The project would not generate additional vehicular traffic nor would it adversely affect any mode of transportation in the area. Therefore, the project would not conflict with any applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance
of the circulation system. Impacts are considered less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

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

Implementation of the project would not result in a change to air traffic patterns. As stated in Section VIII(e), the project site is located within the ALUCP Noise Contours (CNEL) Overlay Zone (SD International Airport 65-70 CNEL), the Airport Approach Overlay Zone (SD International Airport (AAOZ 100-150, AAOZ 150-200), the Airport Influence Areas Overlay Zone (SD International Airport - Review Area 1), the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Part 77 Noticing Area Overlay Zone (SD International Airport 30-40 feet Mean Sea Level and North Island NAS 176-181 feet Mean Sea Level), and the Airport Safety Zone Overlay Zone (SD International Airport - Safety Zone 3NE), identified in the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) for San Diego International Airport. The basic function of the ALUCP (2014) is to promote compatibility between airports and the land uses that surround them to the extent that these areas are not already devoted to incompatible land uses. The ALUCP safeguards the general welfare of the inhabitants within the vicinity of San Diego International Airport and the public in general. The ALUCP provides policies and criteria for the City of San Diego to implement and for the Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) to use when reviewing development proposals.

Although the project site is located within an airport land use plan, the project would not result in a safety hazard residing in the project area. Per the San Diego International Airport ALUCP, Review Area 2 is defined by the combination of the airspace protection and overflight boundaries beyond Review Area 1. Only airspace protection and overflight policies and standards apply within Review Area 2. No impacts would result.

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

The project would not alter existing circulation patterns. No design features or incompatible uses that would increase potential hazards are proposed. The project would not affect emergency access to the project site or adjacent properties. Access would be provided to the project site via Union Street and a private driveway. Driveway design for the project is consistent with City design requirements to ensure safe ingress/egress from the properties. Additionally, the project site is located within an existing residential neighborhood and is not an incompatible use that would create hazardous conditions. No impacts would result.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e) Result in inadequate emergency access?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The project would subdivide one parcel into three parcels. The project site contains two existing structures that would remain. No structures would be constructed. The project would remain consistent with the underlying zone and would not result in inadequate emergency access. The project design would be subject to City review and approval for consistency with all design requirements to ensure that no impediments to emergency access occur. No impacts would result.

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

□ □ □ x

The project would not alter the existing conditions of the project site or adjacent facilities with regard to alternative transportation. The project would subdivide one parcel into three parcels. The project site contains two existing structures that would remain. No structures would be constructed. The project would not result in design measures or circulation features that would conflict with existing policies, plan, or programs supporting alternative transportation. No impacts would result.

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

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

□ □ □ x

Refer to response V(a) above. The project site is located on the City of San Diego’s Historical Resources Sensitivity map. Therefore, a record search of the California Historic Resources Information System (CHRIS) digital database was conducted and reviewed by qualified archaeological City staff to determine presence or absence of potential resources within the project site. No on-site archaeological resources were identified; however, several sites were identified within the one-mile radius. Qualified City staff concluded that a survey should be conducted to determine if any further archaeological evaluations would be required because portions of the project site are vacant.

An archaeological survey was conducted by qualified City staff on November 10, 2016 for the project. The project site was surveyed and evaluated for surface evidence of historic and
prehistoric resources. The existing homes on the project site are surrounded by single and multi-family dwelling units. The survey was focused on the north side of the project site because that area lacks development. Disturbed and ornamental vegetation was present, but overall ground visibility was good. This area also contained slopes exceeding 25 percent grade. No resources were observed during the survey. It appeared that the area has been disturbed.

After the review of previous research in the area and based upon the scope of work, negative survey and the disturbed nature of the site, it was determined that the project would not result in impacts to buried archaeological/historical resources. Further archaeological investigations or mitigation would not be required. No tribal cultural resources as defined by Public Resources Code section 21074 have been identified on the project site. Furthermore, the project site was not determined to be eligible for listing on either the State or local register of historical resources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Refer to response V(a) above. The project site is located on the City of San Diego's Historical Resources Sensitivity map. Therefore, a record search of the California Historic Resources Information System (CHRIS) digital database was conducted and reviewed by qualified archaeological City staff to determine presence or absence of potential resources within the project site. No on-site archaeological resources were identified; however, several sites were identified within the one-mile radius. Qualified City staff concluded that a survey should be conducted to determine if any further archaeological evaluations would be required because portions of the project site are vacant.

An archaeological survey was conducted by qualified City staff on November 10, 2016 for the project. The project site was surveyed and evaluated for surface evidence of historic and prehistoric resources. The existing homes on the project site are surrounded by single and multi-family dwelling units. The survey was focused on the north side of the project site because that area lacks development. Disturbed and ornamental vegetation was present, but overall ground visibility was good. This area also contained slopes exceeding 25 percent grade. No resources were observed during the survey. It appeared that the area has been disturbed.

After the review of previous research in the area and based upon the scope of work, negative survey and the disturbed nature of the site, it was determined that the project would not result in
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

impacts to buried archaeological/historical resources. Further archaeological investigations or mitigation would not be required.

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

XVIII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:

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

The project would subdivide one parcel into three parcels. The project site contains two existing structures that would remain. No structures would be constructed. Implementation of the project would not interrupt existing sewer service to the project site or other surrounding uses. No increase in demand for wastewater disposal or treatment would be created by the project, as compared to current conditions. The project is not anticipated to generate significant amounts of wastewater. Wastewater facilities used by the project would be operated in accordance with the applicable wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). Additionally, the project site is located in an urbanized and developed area. Adequate services are already available to serve the project. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

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

See response XVII(a) above. The project would subdivide one parcel into three parcels. The project site contains two existing structures that would remain. No structures would be constructed. Adequate services are available to serve the project site. Additionally, the project would not significantly increase the demand for water or wastewater treatment services and thus, would not trigger the need for new treatment facilities. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

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

The project would subdivide one parcel into three parcels. The project site contains two existing structures that would remain. No structures would be constructed. The project would not exceed the capacity of the existing storm water drainage systems and therefore, would not require
construction of new or expansion of existing storm water drainage facilities of which could cause significant environmental effects. No impacts would result.

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

The project would subdivide one parcel into three parcels. The project site contains two existing structures that would remain. No structures would be constructed. The project does not meet the CEQA significance threshold requiring the need for the project to prepare a water supply assessment. The existing project site currently receives water service from the City, and adequate services are available to serve the proposed residential dwelling units without requiring new or expanded entitlements. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

The project would subdivide one parcel into three parcels. The project site contains two existing structures that would remain. No structures would be constructed. The project would not adversely affect existing wastewater treatment services. Adequate services are available to serve the project site without requiring new or expanded entitlements. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

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

The project would subdivide one parcel into three parcels. The project site contains two existing structures that would remain. No structures would be constructed. Construction debris and waste would be generated from the construction of the proposed private improvements within the right-of-way. All construction waste from the project site would be transported to an appropriate facility, which would have adequate capacity to accept the limited amount of waste that would be generated by the project. Long-term operation of the project is anticipated to generate typical amounts of solid waste associated with existing residential use. Furthermore, the project would be required to comply with the City's Municipal Code for diversion of both construction waste during the construction of the proposed private improvements within the right-of-way and solid waste during the long-term, operational phase of the existing structures. Impacts are considered to be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulation related to solid waste?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

XIX. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE –

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

As documented in this Initial Study, the project would not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment. As such, no mitigation measures would be incorporated as all impacts are less than significant.

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

As documented in this Initial Study, the project would not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment. As such, no mitigation measures would be required. Other future projects within the surrounding neighborhood or community would be required to comply with applicable local, State, and Federal regulations to reduce the potential impacts to less than
significant, or to the extent possible. Therefore, the project would not contribute potentially significant cumulative environmental impacts.

c) Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

As discussed throughout this document, it is not anticipated that implementation of the project would create conditions that would significantly directly or indirectly impact human beings. No mitigation measures have been required because all impacts are less than significant. For this reason, environmental effects fall below the thresholds established by CEQA and the City and therefore, would not result in significant impacts. Impacts would be less than significant.
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