#### Preliminary Notes on CEQA Environmental Checklist

## PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND BACKGROUND

Project Title:	Torrey Pines Road Improvements between
	Prospect Street and La Jolla Shores Road
Lead agency name and address:	City of San Diego
Contact person and phone number:	
Project Location:	Torrey Pines Road between Prospect St & La
	Jolla Shores Dr.
Project sponsor's name and address:	City of San Diego
General plan description:	
Zoning:	Includes City right of way. If right of way is
	acquired zoning will is LJSPD-SF and RS1-5
Description of project: (Describe the	Minor realignment of roadway, installation of
whole action involved, including but	sidewalks on south side of road, installation of
not limited to later phases of the project, and any secondary, support,	enhanced fencing to meet La Jolla Community
or off-site features necessary for its	plan, Install guardrail in two specific locations,
implementation.)	install retaining walls as required and minor
. ,	grading to accommodate walls for sidewalk
	installation. Additional easements for
	construction required and potential additional
	right of way.
Surrounding land uses and setting;	A 4 lane modified collector road with cliffs on
briefly describe the project's	the south side and embankments in locations
surroundings:	along north side of the roadway, striking views
	of ocean from road adjacent residential
	properties throughout.
Other public agencies whose	The project is in the City of San Diego Coastal
approval is required (e.g. permits,	Zone, appealable to the Coastal Commission
financial approval, or participation agreements):	

### ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project. Please see the checklist beginning on page 3 for additional information.

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

## **DETERMINATION:**

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and A NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
I find that 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.
I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
I find that 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 NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required

Signature:	Date:
Printed Name:	For:

### **CEQA Environmental Checklist**

This checklist identifies physical, biological, social and economic factors that might be affected by the proposed project. In many cases, background studies performed in connection with the projects indicate no impacts. A NO IMPACT answer in the last column reflects this determination. Where there is a need for clarifying discussion, the discussion is included either following the applicable section of the checklist or is within the body of the environmental document itself. The words "significant" and "significance" used throughout the following checklist are related to CEQA, not NEPA, impacts. The questions in this form are intended to encourage the thoughtful assessment of impacts and do not represent thresholds of significance.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS: Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista				
<ul> <li>b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway</li> </ul>				
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?				
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?				

Prepare <u>Visual Analysis</u> and report that addresses effects to view sheds and aesthetics utilizing 30%-60% design details. This should particularly include project retaining walls and fences

<b>II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES</b> : 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 Dept. 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 the forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Convert 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?				
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				$\boxtimes$
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?				$\boxtimes$
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				$\square$
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?				$\boxtimes$

# There are no Agricultural resources known to be affected by this project. This section should be "Not Applicable"

<b>III. AIR QUALITY</b> : Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?				
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?				
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)?				
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?				
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?				

Prepare <u>Air Quality Report</u>; base report on traffic control plans and 2007 Corridor study (has traffic loads, may require traffic study update) use findings to address questions in this section.

Comment: Potential for sensitive receptors at nearby residences affected by construction. City of San Diego contract requirements will be followed. Reduced right turn lane at Torrey Pines Road and Prospect St. may affect long term impact

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, 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?				
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?				
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?				
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?				
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				
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?				

Perform Biological survey and prepare <u>Biological Letter Report</u> to verify biology in the affected areas.

Comment: Conduct survey of impacted vegetated areas of the project. Include staging areas.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?				
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?				
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				
<ul> <li>d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</li> </ul>				

## Prepare a <u>Cultural Resources Studies</u> and sensitive archeological sites by the project. Known paleontological sensitive area that requires monitoring for possible marine fossils, etc. during excavation work in construction

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42? The active Rose Canyon fault has been mapped crossing the eastern portions of the project alignment. The fault also crosses residential properties on opposite sides of the project alignment. There is a high potential for ground rupture at the alignment in the event of a nearby seismic event. The proposed project will not exacerbate the potential for fault rupture.				
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? The site is subject to potentially strong seismic ground shaking on a regional or local active fault. The proposed project				$\boxtimes$

will not exacerbate the potential for ground shaking.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? The eastern end of the alignment is underlain by alluvium which could be subject to liquefaction on a regional or local active fault in the region. The proposed project will not exacerbate the potential for seismic-related ground failure or liquefaction. iv) Landslides? No landslides are mapped within or adjacent to the subject alignment. In the City of San Diego Seismic Safety Study (2008), the central portion of the alignment is mapped as being underlain by slide prone formations. Since no landslides are mapped on the site, the alignment is not expected to expose people or structures to potential adverse effects due to landslides.

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? **The** project alignment is currently paved, vegetated and urbanized. Construction of the project is not anticipated to result in substantial soil erosion if graded in accordance with the City of San Diego grading ordinance and if Best Management Practices are utilized to prevent surface water from running over slopes. Due to the relative shallow grading, substantial loss of topsoil is not anticipated, if topsoil is present.

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? In the City of San Diego Seismic Safety Study (2008), the central portion of the alignment is mapped as being underlain by slide prone formations. The eastern end of the alignment is underlain by alluvium which could be subject to liquefaction on a regional or local active fault in the region. No landslides are mapped on the site. It is not expected that the site could become unstable due to an off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence or collapse, if the project is constructed in accordance with the City of San Diego ordinances and current practices of a reputable geotechnical engineer and engineering geologist.

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? **Expansive soils may be present on the** site. The proposed project will not exacerbate potentially expansive soil if constructed in accordance with City of San Diego ordinances.

	$\square$
	$\boxtimes$
	$\boxtimes$

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? Septic tanks or other waste water disposal systems are not anticipated to be a part of the proposed		
alignment.		

# A Geotechnical Reconnaissance study (June 4, 2010, Ninyo and Moore) was prepared for the preliminary project design.

VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?				
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?				

Prepare <u>Greenhouse Gas Analysis</u> to describe impacts of greenhouse gases to the project. Include considerations for excavation operations and traffic impacts that affect temporary and permanent project features. Permanent feature may include reduced length of right turn lane at Prospect St.

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?				$\square$
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?				
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				$\square$
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?				
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				$\square$
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?				$\square$
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				$\boxtimes$
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?				$\boxtimes$

An Initial Site Assessment June 4, 2010, Ninyo & Moore) was prepared for the preliminary design. The unauthorized release case at the gas station located at the east end of the alignment is closed and is presumed an unlikely possibility that contamination will be encountered. Project design specifications must include verbiage in event contamination is encountered and bid items to identify unit rates.

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?				
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?				
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?				
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?				
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?				
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?				
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				$\square$
<ul> <li>i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?</li> </ul>				$\square$
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow				$\square$

# Prepare <u>Water Quality Technical Report</u> and <u>Drainage Study</u> for the project and use to address the items of this section.

Comment: Project is not in 100-yr flood zone. A SWPPP prepared in accordance with City of San Diego requirements is required for construction.

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Physically divide an established community?				$\boxtimes$
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?				
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				$\square$

Discuss in the CEQA document text. Additional sidewalk from project would bring community together and make alignment more useable. No land use change in right of way; possible acquisition of private property would change property land use. Project consistent with La Jolla Community Plan and Torrey Pines Corridor Study (October 2007). Project is over 100 feet from beach therefore Coastal Bluff Requirements not applicable. <u>Bio report</u> to review if habitat or community conservation plan affects project

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?		$\square$
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?		$\boxtimes$

This section "Not Applicable" to the project.

XII. NOISE: Would the project result in:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?				
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?				
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				
) 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?				

# Prepare <u>Noise Report</u> to identify whether mitigation for impacts is required.

Comment: construction equipment generates significant noise; determine construction work hours and other mitigation to meet City of San Diego requirements. Possible permanent impact from reduction of right turn length at Prospect St intersection.

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)?		$\boxtimes$
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?		$\boxtimes$
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?		$\boxtimes$

## No impact to housing by project

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision 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 ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
Fire protection?				
Police protection?				
Schools?				
Parks?				
Other public facilities?				

Discuss in CEQA document. Temporary impact during construction.

Comment: Fire stations 9 and 13 are located on either side of the project. Construction may delay response by obstructing access; however project phasing would influence these temporary impacts. This applies to police, school and park access. Emergency lane in middle of alignment is proposed to remain after construction.

XV. RECREATION:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?				$\square$
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?				$\square$

## No impacts or additional parks in current project.

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?				
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?				
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that result in substantial safety risks?				$\boxtimes$
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				$\boxtimes$
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?		$\square$		
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?				$\boxtimes$

Prepare <u>Updated Traffic Study</u>. Traffic impacts are temporary impacts to be mitigated with detours and other traffic control features during construction, designed in accordance with City of San Diego traffic control guidelines, with exception of shortening right turn lane on Torrey Pines Road at Prospect St. Existing and new bicycle lanes are consistent with the 2010 Draft Bicycle Master Plan update.

XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				$\square$
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?				
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?			$\square$	
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?				$\boxtimes$
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?				
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?				$\boxtimes$
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				$\square$

## Improved stormwater facilities will be designed at intersection with Hillside Drive because of revised road profile. Design will be in accordance with City of San Diego Drainage Guidelines,

#### XVIII. 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, substantially 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?		
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 future projects)?		
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?		

## Too soon to determine