ATTACHMENT 3

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

FOR THE NORTH PARK COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE

REGARDING FINAL PROGRAM ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

FOR THE NORTH PARK AND GOLDEN HILL COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATES

PROJECT NUMBER 380611

SCH No. 2013121076

September 2016

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM FOR THE

NORTH PARK COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE AND ASSOCIATED DISCRETIONARY ACTIONS (PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE 21081.6)

This Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) is designed to ensure compliance with Public Resources Code Section 21081.6 during implementation of mitigation measures. This program identifies at a minimum: the department responsible for the monitoring, what is to be monitored, how the monitoring shall be accomplished, the monitoring and reporting schedule, and completion requirements. A record of the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program will be maintained at the offices of the Land Development Review Division, 1222 First Avenue, Fifth Floor, San Diego, California 92101. All mitigation measures contained in the Program Environmental Impact Report SCH No. 2013121076; PROJECT NUMBER 380611 shall be made conditions of future development within the North Park CPU area as further described below.

I. Transportation and Circulation

Intersections

a. Impacts

As described in Section 6.3 of the Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR), the proposed North Park Community Plan Update (CPU) and associated discretionary actions would have a cumulative traffic-related impact at eight of the eleven study intersections.

b. Mitigation Framework

The Traffic Impact Study (TIS) identified several intersection improvements that would reduce potentially significant impacts. As discussed in the Findings a number of these mitigation measures are infeasible due to conflicts with the overall mobility vision and other policies of the North Park CPU and are precluded by surrounding development. These measures are not included in this MMRP. The following measures addressing intersection impacts are included within the proposed Impact Fee Studies (IFS) and recommended for implementation.

TRANS 6.3-5 University Avenue & Boundary Street (Impact 6.3-5): Modify signal and restripe southbound approach to provide exclusive right-turn, through, and left-turn lanes on Boundary Street.

TRANS 6.3-7 North Park Way/I-805 SB Ramps & Boundary Street/33rd Street (Impact 6.3-7): Signalize intersection and add a second left-turn lane in the southbound direction on Boundary Street and widen the I-805 southbound on-ramp to add an additional receiving lane. An additional lane may be required by Caltrans on the SB I-805 off-ramp.

c. Mitigation Funding, Timing, and Responsibility

Funding sources would include the IFS fees required of future development and may also include grants from SANDAG and/or Caltrans. As discussed in the Findings this impact was ultimately determined to be significant and unavoidable based on the lack of full funding and lack of assurance of implementation of the measure prior to occurrence of an impact. Mitigation timing would be driven by the timing of individual, project-level development related to impacts in the North Park CPU area. However, the City would be responsible for collecting development fees associated with future development and coordinating with SANDAG and Caltrans regarding prioritization and implementation of improvements.

Roadway Segments

a. Impacts

As described in Section 6.3 of the PEIR, the proposed North Park CPU and associated discretionary actions would have a cumulative traffic related impact on 43 of the 95 roadway segments within the study area.

b. Mitigation Framework

The TIS identified several roadway segment improvements that would reduce potentially significant impacts. As discussed in the Findings, a number of mitigation measures are infeasible due to conflicts with the overall mobility vision and other policies of the North Park CPU and are precluded by surrounding development. These measures are not included in this MMRP. Only two measures addressing intersection impacts are included within the proposed IFS and recommended for implementation.

TRANS 6.3-13 Boundary Street from University Avenue to North Park Way (Impact 6.3-13): Widen the roadway to a 4 lane collector with a continuous left-turn lane.

TRANS 6.3-18 Madison Avenue from Texas Street to Ohio Street (Impact 6.3-18): Restripe the roadway to a 2 lane collector with continuous left-turn lane.

c. Mitigation Funding, Timing, and Responsibility

Funding sources would include the IFS fees required of future development and may also include grants from SANDAG and/or Caltrans. As discussed in the Findings, these impacts were ultimately determined to be significant and unavoidable based on the lack of full funding and lack of assurance of implementation of the measure prior to occurrence of an impact. Mitigation timing would be driven by the timing of individual, project level development related to impacts in the North Park CPU area. However, the City would be responsible for collecting development fees associated with future development and coordinating with SANDAG and Caltrans regarding prioritization and implementation of improvements.

Ramp Meters

a. Impacts

As described in Section 6.3 of the PEIR, implementation of the North Park CPU would result in three significant cumulative ramp meter impacts.

b. Mitigation Framework

As discussed in the PEIR and Findings, the ramp meter impacts would be significant and unavoidable because the City does not have approval authority over freeways and there is uncertainty as to the timing of implementation of improvements and whether they will occur prior to the occurrence of impacts. Additionally, none of the impacted ramp meters are included in SANDAG's San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan (RP); thus, fair share funding for the impacted ramps would be infeasible at this time. However, the following measure is proposed to partially mitigate the significant impact:

TRANS 6.3-33 The City of San Diego shall coordinate with Caltrans to address ramp capacity at impacted on-ramp locations (Impacts 6.3-33 through 6.3-35). Improvements could include additional lanes, interchange reconfiguration, etc.; however, specific capacity improvements are still undetermined, as these are future improvements that must be defined more over time. At the project level, significant impacts at locations outside of the jurisdiction of the City could be partially mitigated in the form of fair share contribution or Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures that encourage carpooling and other alternative means of transportation consistent with proposed CPU policies. Fair share contributions may be provided at the project level for impacted ramps where the impacted facility is included in the SANDAG RP; however, at this time none of the impacted ramps are included in the SANDAG RP.

c. Mitigation Funding, Timing, and Responsibility

As discussed above and in the Findings, specific funding and timing of ramp improvement is not known at this time because no improvements to these ramps are identified in the SANDAG RP. Potential funding sources may include SANDAG and/or Caltrans, as noted. Thus, the impacts to freeway ramps would be significant and unavoidable. However, the City will coordinate with Caltrans regarding ramp improvements on an ongoing basis.

II. Air Quality

Conflicts with Air Quality Plans

a. Impacts

The San Diego County Regional Air Quality Standards (RAQS) and State Implementation Plan (SIP) outline plans and control measures designed to provide attainment with applicable California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS) and National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). Future operational emissions under the proposed North Park CPU would be greater than future operational emissions under the adopted Community Plan. This is due to the increase in residential

uses when compared to the adopted Community Plan. Therefore, emissions of ozone precursors (reactive organic gas [ROG] and oxides of nitrogen [NOx]) would be greater than what is accounted for in the RAQS. Thus, the proposed North Park CPU would conflict with implementation of the RAQS, and could have a potentially significant impact on regional air quality.

b. Mitigation Framework

The following mitigation measure would be implemented to address the potential impacts:

AQ 6.4-1 Prior to the next update of the RAQS and within six months of the certification of the Final PEIR, the City shall provide a revised land use map for the North Park CPU area to SANDAG to ensure that any revisions to the population and employment projections used by the Air Pollution Control District (APCD) in updating the RAQS and the SIP will accurately reflect anticipated growth due to the proposed North Park CPU.

c. Mitigation Funding, Timing, and Responsibility

The RAQS are updated periodically by applicable air quality districts. Thus, the update would occur without additional need for funding. Mitigation timing would be driven by the schedule of the San Diego APCD for their four year updates to the RAQS. However, within six months of the certification of the Final PEIR, the City shall provide a revised land use map for the North Park CPU area to SANDAG to ensure that any revisions to the population and employment projections used by APCD in updating the RAQS and the SIP are used.

Air Quality Standards

a. Impacts

Operational emissions associated with the proposed North Park CPU would be greater for all pollutants when compared to the adopted Community Plan. Additionally, the proposed North Park CPU would result in emissions in excess of project-level thresholds. Thus, the proposed North Park CPU would have a potentially significant impact on regional air quality (Impact 6.4-2).

b. Mitigation Framework

The following mitigation measure would be implemented to address the potential impacts:

AQ 6.4-2 Development that would significantly impact air quality, either individually or cumulatively, shall receive entitlement only if it is conditioned with all reasonable mitigation to avoid, minimize, or offset the impact.

c. Mitigation Funding, Timing, and Responsibility

As future discretionary projects are implemented, applicants, or developers would be required to fund project specific analysis related to air quality when warranted by City CEQA Guidelines.

III. Noise

Temporary Construction Noise

a. Impacts

Construction activities related to implementation of the proposed North Park CPU and associated discretionary actions would potentially generate short-term noise levels in excess of 75 A-weighted decibels average sound level [dB(A) L_{eq}] at adjacent properties. While the City regulates noise associated with construction equipment and activities through enforcement of noise ordinance standards (e.g., days of the week and hours of operation) and imposition of conditions of approval for building or grading permits, there is a procedure in place that allows for a permit to deviate from the noise ordinance. Due to the highly developed nature of the North Park CPU area with sensitive receivers potentially located in proximity to construction sites, there is a potential for construction of future projects to expose existing sensitive land use to significant noise levels.

Vibration impacts during construction could be avoided by scheduling construction activities with the highest potential to produce perceptible vibration to hours with least potential to affect nearby properties. However, pile driving within 95 feet of existing structures has the potential to exceed 0.20 inch per second, and would be potentially significant.

b. Mitigation Framework

In order to mitigate impacts related to construction noise (Impact 6.6-4), the following mitigation measure would be implemented.

NOISE 6.6-1 At the project level, development projects will be required to incorporate feasible mitigation measures. Typically, noise can be reduced to comply with City standards when standard construction noise control measures are enforced at the project site and when the duration of the noise-generating construction period is limited to one construction season (typically one year) or less.

- Construction activities shall be limited to the hours between 7:00 A.M. and 7:00 P.M. Construction is not allowed on legal holidays as specified in Section 21.04 of the San Diego Municipal Code, with exception of Columbus Day and Washington's Birthday, or on Sundays. (Consistent with Section 59.5.0404 of the San Diego Municipal Code).

- Equip all internal combustion engine-driven equipment with intake and exhaust mufflers that are in good condition and appropriate for the equipment.

- Locate stationary noise-generating equipment (e.g., compressors) as far as possible from adjacent residential receivers.

- Acoustically shield stationary equipment located near residential receivers with temporary noise barriers.

- Utilize "quiet" air compressors and other stationary noise sources where technology exists.

- The contractor shall prepare a detailed construction plan identifying the schedule for major noise-generating construction activities. The construction plan shall identify a procedure for coordination with adjacent residential land uses so that construction activities can be scheduled to minimize noise disturbance.

- Designate a "disturbance coordinator" who would be responsible for responding to any complaints about construction noise. The disturbance coordinator will determine the cause of the noise complaint (e.g., bad muffler, etc.) and will require that reasonable measures be implemented to correct the problem.

In order to mitigate impacts relative to vibration during construction (Impact 6.6-5), the following mitigation measure would be implemented.

NOISE 6.6-2 For discretionary projects where construction would include vibration-generating activities, such as pile driving, within 95 feet of existing structures, site-specific vibration studies shall be conducted to ensure the development project would not adversely affect adjacent properties to the satisfaction of the Chief Building Official. Such efforts shall be conducted by a qualified structural engineer and could include:

- Identify sites that would include vibration compaction activities such as pile driving and have the potential to generate groundborne vibration and the sensitivity of nearby structures to groundborne vibration.

- Develop a vibration monitoring and construction contingency plan to identify structures where monitoring would be conducted; set up a vibration monitoring schedule; define structure-specific vibration limits; and address the need to conduct photo, elevation, and crack surveys to document before and after construction conditions. Construction contingencies would be identified for when vibration levels approach the limits.

- Monitor vibration during initial demolition activities and during pile-driving activities. Monitoring results may indicate the need for more or less intensive measurements.

- When vibration levels approach limits, suspend construction and implement contingencies to either lower vibration levels or secure the affected structures.

- Conduct post-survey on structures where either monitoring has indicated high levels or complaints of damage have been made. Make appropriate repairs or compensation where damage has occurred as a result of construction activities.

c. Mitigation Funding, Timing, and Responsibility

Funding for the described noise mitigation would be provided on a project-specific basis, during the discretionary review process for individual projects to be completed and funded by applicants and/or developers. During discretionary review site specific analysis would be completed and specific conditions would be imposed on projects by the City that would be implemented before, during and after construction as warranted by the site specific reports and as specified in mitigation measures Noise 6.6-1 and 6.6-2. Responsibility for noise-related mitigation monitoring, enforcement and reporting would be with the City of San Diego.

IV. Historical Resources

Historic Structures, Objects, or Sites

a. Impacts

As described in Section 6.7, Historical Resources, of the PEIR, implementation of the proposed North Park CPU and associated discretionary actions could result in an alteration of a historic building, structure, object, or site. This impact is potentially significant.

b. Mitigation Framework

The following mitigation measures (HIST-6.7-1) provides a framework that would be required of all future development projects with the potential to impact significant historical resources.

HIST-6.7-1 HISTORIC BUILDINGS, STRUCTURES, AND OBJECTS

Prior to issuance of any permit for a development project implemented in accordance with the proposed North Park CPU that would directly or indirectly affect a building/structure in excess of 45 years of age, the City shall determine whether the affected building/structure is historically significant. The evaluation of historic architectural resources shall be based on criteria such as: age, location, context, association with an important person or event, uniqueness, or structural integrity, as indicated in the Guidelines.

Preferred mitigation for historic buildings or structures shall be to avoid the resource through project redesign. If the resource cannot be entirely avoided, all prudent and feasible measures to minimize harm to the resource shall be taken. Depending upon project impacts, measures shall include, but are not limited to:

- Preparing a historic resource management plan;
- Adding new construction which is compatible in size, scale, materials, color and workmanship to the historic resource (such additions, whether portions of existing buildings or additions to historic districts, shall be clearly distinguishable from historic fabric);
- Repairing damage according to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation;

- Screening incompatible new construction from view through the use of berms, walls and landscaping in keeping with the historic period and character of the resource;

- Shielding historic properties from noise generators through the use of sound walls, double glazing and air conditioning; and

- Removing industrial pollution at the source of production.

Specific types of historical resource reports, outlined in Section III of the HRG, are required to document the methods to be used to determine the presence or absence of historical resources, to identify potential impacts from a proposed project, and to evaluate the significance of any historical resources identified. If potentially significant impacts to an identified historical resource are identified these reports will also recommend appropriate mitigation to reduce the impacts to below a level of significance, where possible. If required, mitigation programs can also be included in the report.

c. Mitigation Funding, Timing, and Responsibility

Mitigation Measure HIST-6.7-1 would be implemented prior to issuance of any permit for a development project under the North Park CPU that could directly affect either a building/structure in excess of 45 years of age that has been determined to be historically significant by the City. Funding for the described mitigation related to historical resources would be provided on a project-specific basis by the associated property owner(s) and/or developer(s). Responsibility for mitigation monitoring, enforcement and reporting related to historical resources would be with the City of San Diego.

Prehistoric Resources, Sacred Sites and Human Remains

a. Impacts

As described in Section 6.7 of the PEIR, important prehistoric resources, religious or sacred resources could occur within the North Park CPU area and could be impacted by future development. As a result, development pursuant to the North Park CPU could have a significant impact on prehistoric resources, religious or sacred resources, or human remains.

b. Mitigation Framework

The following mitigation measures (HIST-6.7-2) provides a framework that would be required of all future development projects with the potential to impact significant religious and sacred resources.

HIST-6.7-2 ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

Prior to issuance of any permit for a development project implemented in accordance with the proposed North Park CPU that could directly affect an archaeological or tribal cultural resource, the City shall require the following steps be taken to determine: (1) the presence of archaeological or tribal cultural resources and (2) the appropriate mitigation for any significant resources which

may be impacted by a development activity. Sites may include, but are not limited to, residential and commercial properties, privies, trash pits, building foundations, and industrial features representing the contributions of people from diverse socio-economic and ethnic backgrounds. Sites may also include resources associated with prehistoric Native American activities.

Initial Determination

The environmental analyst will determine the likelihood for the project site to contain historical resources by reviewing site photographs and existing historic information (e.g., Archaeological Sensitivity Maps, the Archaeological Map Book, and the City's "Historical Inventory of Important Architects, Structures, and People in San Diego") and may conduct a site visit, as needed. If there is any evidence that the site contains archaeological or tribal cultural resources, then an archaeological evaluation consistent with the City Guidelines would be required. All individuals conducting any phase of the archaeological evaluation program must meet professional qualifications in accordance with the City Guidelines.

Step 1:

Based on the results of the Initial Determination, if there is evidence that the site contains a historical resource, preparation of a historic evaluation is required. The evaluation report would generally include background research, field survey, archaeological testing and analysis. Before actual field reconnaissance would occur, background research is required which includes a record search at the SCIC at San Diego State University and the San Diego Museum of Man. A review of the Sacred Lands File maintained by the NAHC must also be conducted at this time. Information about existing archaeological collections should also be obtained from the San Diego Archaeology Center and any tribal repositories or museums.

In addition to the record searches mentioned above, background information may include, but is not limited to: examining primary sources of historical information (e.g., deeds and wills), secondary sources (e.g., local histories and genealogies), Sanborn Fire Maps, and historic cartographic and aerial photograph sources; reviewing previous archeological research in similar areas, models that predict site distribution, and archaeological, architectural, and historical site inventory files; and conducting informant interviews. The results of the background information would be included in the evaluation report.

Once the background research is complete, a field reconnaissance must be conducted by individuals whose qualifications meet the standards outlined in the City Guidelines. Consultants are encouraged to employ innovative survey techniques when conducting enhanced reconnaissance, including, but not limited to, remote sensing, ground penetrating radar, and other soil resistivity techniques as determined on a case-by-case basis. Native American participation is required for field surveys when there is likelihood that the project site contains prehistoric archaeological resources or traditional cultural properties. If through background research and field surveys historical resources are identified, then an evaluation of

significance, based on the City Guidelines, must be performed by a qualified archaeologist.

Step 2

Where a recorded archaeological site or Tribal Cultural Resource (as defined in the Public Resources Code) is identified, the City would be required to initiate consultation with identified California Indian tribes pursuant to the provisions in Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1 and 21080.3.2., in accordance with Assembly Bill 52. It should be noted that during the consultation process tribal representative(s) will be directly involved in making recommendations regarding the significance of a tribal cultural resource which also could be a prehistoric archaeological site. A testing program may be recommended which requires reevaluation of the proposed project in consultation with the Native American representative which could result in a combination of project redesign to avoid and/or preserve significant resources as well as mitigation in the form of data recovery and monitoring (as recommended by the qualified archaeologist and Native American representative). The archaeological testing program, if required shall include evaluating the horizontal and vertical dimensions of a site, the chronological placement, site function, artifact/ecofact density and variability, presence/absence of subsurface features, and research potential. A thorough discussion of testing methodologies, including surface and subsurface investigations, can be found in the City Guidelines. Results of the consultation process will determine the nature and extent of any additional archaeological evaluation or changes to the proposed project.

The results from the testing program shall be evaluated against the Significance Thresholds found in the Guidelines. If significant historical resources are identified within the Area of Potential Effect, the site may be eligible for local designation. However, this process would not proceed until such time that the tribal consultation has been concluded and an agreement is reached (or not reached) regarding significance of the resource and appropriate mitigation measures are identified. When appropriate, the final testing report must be submitted to Historical Resources Board staff for eligibility determination and possible designation. An agreement on the appropriate form of mitigation is required prior to distribution of a draft environmental document. If no significant resources are found, and site conditions are such that there is no potential for further discoveries, then no further action is required. Resources found to be non-significant as a result of a survey and/or assessment will require no further work beyond documentation of the resources on the appropriate Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) site forms and inclusion of results in the survey and/or assessment report. If no significant resources are found, but results of the initial evaluation and testing phase indicates there is still a potential for resources to be present in portions of the property that could not be tested, then mitigation monitoring is required.

Step 3:

Preferred mitigation for historical resources is to avoid the resource through project redesign. If the resource cannot be entirely avoided, all prudent and feasible measures to minimize harm shall be taken. For archaeological resources where preservation is not an option, a Research Design and Data Recovery Program is required, which includes a Collections Management Plan for review and approval. When tribal cultural resources are present and also cannot be avoided, appropriate and feasible mitigation will be determined through the tribal consultation process and incorporated into the overall data recovery program, where applicable or project specific mitigation measures incorporated into the project. The data recovery program shall be based on a written research design and is subject to the provisions as outlined in CEQA, Section 21083.2. The data recovery program must be reviewed and approved by the City's Environmental Analyst prior to distribution of a draft CEQA document and shall include the results of the tribal consultation process. Archaeological monitoring may be required during building demolition and/or construction grading when significant resources are known or suspected to be present on a site, but cannot be recovered prior to grading due to obstructions such as, but not limited to, existing development or dense vegetation.

A Native American observer must be retained for all subsurface investigations, including geotechnical testing and other ground-disturbing activities, whenever a Native American tribal cultural resource or any archaeological site located on City property or within the Area of Potential Effect of a City project would be impacted. In the event that human remains are encountered during data recovery and/or a monitoring program, the provisions of the California Public Resources Code Section 5097 must be followed. In the event that human remains are discovered during project grading, work shall halt in that area and the procedures set forth in the California Public Resources Code (Section 50987.98) and State Health and Safety Code (Section 7050.5), and in the federal, state, and local regulations described above shall be undertaken. These provisions will be outlined in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program included in a subsequent project-specific environmental document. The Native American monitor shall be consulted during the preparation of the written report, at which time they may express concerns about the treatment of sensitive resources. If the Native American community requests participation of an observer for subsurface investigations on private property, the request shall be honored.

Step 4:

Archaeological Resource Management reports shall be prepared by qualified professionals as determined by the criteria set forth in Appendix B of the Guidelines. The discipline shall be tailored to the resource under evaluation. In cases involving complex resources, such as traditional cultural properties, rural landscape districts, sites involving a combination of prehistoric and historic archaeology, or historic districts, a team of experts will be necessary for a complete evaluation.

Specific types of historical resource reports are required to document the methods (see Section III of the Guidelines) used to determine the presence or absence of historical resources; to identify the potential impacts from proposed development and evaluate the significance of any identified historical resources; to document the appropriate curation of archaeological collections (e.g. collected materials and the associated records); in the case of potentially significant impacts to historical resources, to recommend appropriate mitigation measures that would reduce the impacts to below a level of significance; and to document the results of mitigation and monitoring programs, if required.

Archaeological Resource Management reports shall be prepared in conformance with the California Office of Historic Preservation "Archaeological Resource Management Reports: Recommended Contents and Format" (see Appendix C of the Guidelines), which will be used by Environmental staff in the review of archaeological resource reports. Consultants must ensure that archaeological resource reports are prepared consistent with this checklist. This requirement will standardize the content and format of all archaeological technical reports submitted to the City. A confidential appendix must be submitted (under separate cover) along with historical resources reports for archaeological sites and tribal cultural resources containing the confidential resource maps and records search information gathered during the background study. In addition, a Collections Management Plan shall be prepared for projects which result in a substantial collection of artifacts and must address the management and research goals of the project and the types of materials to be collected and curated based on a sampling strategy that is acceptable to the City. Appendix D (Historical Resources Report Form) may be used when no archaeological resources were identified within the project boundaries.

Step 5:

For Archaeological Resources: All cultural materials, including original maps, field notes, non-burial related artifacts, catalog information, and final reports recovered during public and/or private development projects must be permanently curated with an appropriate institution, one which has the proper facilities and staffing for insuring research access to the collections consistent with state and federal standards, unless otherwise determined during the tribal consultation process. In the event that a prehistoric and/or historic deposit is encountered during construction monitoring, a Collections Management Plan would be required in accordance with the project MMRP. The disposition of human remains and burial related artifacts that cannot be avoided or are inadvertently discovered is governed by state (i.e., Assembly Bill 2641 [Coto] and California Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 2001) [Health and Safety Code 8010-8011]) and federal (i.e., Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act [U.S.C. 3001-3013]) law, and must be treated in a dignified and culturally appropriate manner with respect for the deceased individual(s) and their descendants. Any human bones and associated grave goods of Native American

origin shall be turned over to the appropriate Native American group for repatriation.

Arrangements for long-term curation of all recovered artifacts must be established between the applicant/property owner and the consultant prior to the initiation of the field reconnaissance. When tribal cultural resources are present, or non-burial-related artifacts associated with tribal cultural resources area suspected to be recovered, the treatment and disposition of such resources will be determined during the tribal consultation process. This information must then be included in the archaeological survey, testing, and/or data recovery report submitted to the City for review and approval. Curation must be accomplished in accordance with the California State Historic Resources Commission's Guidelines for the Curation of Archaeological Collection (dated May 7, 1993) and, if federal funding is involved, Title 36 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Part 79. Additional information regarding curation is provided in Section II of the Guidelines.

c. Mitigation Funding, Timing, and Responsibility

Funding for the described mitigation related to religious and sacred resources would be provided on a project-specific basis by the associated property owners and/or developers. Mitigation timing and responsibilities for mitigation monitoring, enforcement, and reporting related to prehistoric and sacred resources and human remains would be the same as that described above under Historical Resources.

V. Paleontological Resources

a. Impacts

Because of high sensitivity for paleontological resources within the San Diego and Mission Valley formations, grading into these formations could potentially destroy fossil resources. Therefore, implementation of future discretionary and ministerial projects within the proposed North Park CPU area within these formations has the potential to result in significant impacts to paleontological resources.

b. Mitigation Framework

In order to reduce the potential adverse impact to paleontological resources associated with discretionary projects, the project would incorporate the mitigation measure identified in the General Plan PEIR addressing paleontological resource impacts.

The following measure would apply to any discretionary project that proposes subsurface disturbance within a high sensitivity formation. If no subsurface disturbance is planned, then paleontological resources would not be impacted and development of a project-specific paleontological monitoring and discovery treatment plan would not be necessary. The following mitigation measure would reduce Impact 6.10 to a less than significant level.

PALEO 6.10 Prior to the approval of subsequent discretionary development projects implemented in accordance with the proposed North Park CPU, the City shall determine the potential for impacts to paleontological resources within a high sensitivity formation based on review of the project application submitted, and recommendations of a project-level analysis completed in accordance with the steps presented below. Future projects shall be sited and designed to minimize impacts on paleontological resources in accordance with the City's Paleontological Resources Guidelines and CEQA Significance Thresholds. Monitoring for paleontological resources required during construction activities shall be implemented at the project-level and shall provide mitigation for the loss of important fossil remains with future subsequent development projects that are subject to environmental review.

I. Prior to Project Approval

A. The environmental analyst shall complete a project-level analysis of potential impacts on paleontological resources. The analysis shall include a review of the applicable USGS Quad maps to identify the underlying geologic formations, and shall determine if construction of a project would:

- Required over 1,000 cubic yards of excavation and/or a 10-foot, or greater, depth in a high resources potential geologic deposit/formation/ rock unit.

- Require over 2,000 cubic yards of excavation and/or 10-foot, or greater, depth in a moderate resource potential geologic deposit/formation/rock unit.

- Require construction within a known fossil location or fossil recovery site. Resource potential within a formation is based on the Paleontological Monitoring Determination Matrix.

B. If construction of a project would occur within a formation with a moderate to high resource potential, monitoring during construction would be required.

- Monitoring is always required when grading on a fossil recovery site or a known fossil location.

- Monitoring may also be needed at shallower depths if fossil resources are present or likely to be present after review of source materials or consultation with an expert in fossil resources (e.g., the San Diego Natural History Museum).

- Monitoring may be required for shallow grading (<10 feet) when a site has previously bene graded and/or unweathered geologic deposits/ formations/rock units are present at the surface.

- Monitoring is not required when grading documented artificial fill. When it has been determined that a future project has the potential to impact a geologic formation with a high or moderate fossil sensitivity rating a Paleontological MMRP shall be implemented during construction grading activities.

c. Mitigation Funding, Timing, and Responsibility

As noted in Mitigation Measure PALEO-6.10, applicable elements of this measure would be implemented prior to issuance of any discretionary permits, construction permits, during construction, and post-construction. Funding for the described mitigation related to paleontological resources would be provided on a project-specific basis by the associated property owners and/or developers. Responsibility for mitigation monitoring, enforcement and reporting related to paleontological resources would be with the City of San Diego.